



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

QUARTERLY JOURNAL

OF THE

STATISTICAL SOCIETY.

SEPTEMBER, 1857.

On the STATISTICS of the British LAND-TAX ASSESSMENT, and particularly of England and Wales, from 1636 to 1856; with Notes upon the POLITICAL ARITHMETIC of the earlier period of its settlement.
By FREDERICK HENDRIKS, *Actuary.*

[Read before the Statistical Society of London, 19th May, 1857.]

INDEX OF CONTENTS.

	Page		Page
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.		TABLES ILLUSTRATIVE OF PARTS I. AND II.	
§ 1.— <i>Explanation and Abstract</i>	241	TABLE A.— <i>Land-Tax Redeemed and Unredeemed in each County of England and Wales as at 25th March, 1843</i>	251
PART I.—LAND-TAX STATISTICS, A.D. 1798-1856.		TABLE B.— <i>Redemption of Land-Tax in Great Britain, showing its Annual Progress from 1798 to 1856, and its Effect on the National Debt and Revenue, giving also the Amounts of Stock and Dividend cancelled</i>	254
§ 2.— <i>Legislation on Land-Tax Redemption.—Results from the period of Mr. Pitt's measure to the present time</i>	249	TABLE C.— <i>Rates per Pound of the Land-Tax Quotas of England and Wales</i>	266
Mr. Gladstone's Measure of 1853	259	TABLE D.— <i>Annual Value of various descriptions of Real Property in England and Wales in 1814 compared with 1848, Calculation of Per-Centages of each description at the two Periods, and of the Aggregate Increase in the Thirty-Four Years 1814-48</i>	271
Mr. Mackinnon's Proposal of 1856	261	TABLE E.— <i>Collective View of the Proportionate Land-Tax Quotas from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century</i>	288
§ 3.— <i>Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1836.—Review of Messrs. Wood and Garnett's Statistics</i>	262	APPENDIX I.— <i>Land-Tax Redeemed from 1798 to 25th March, 1849</i>	303
§ 4.— <i>Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1846.—Review of Statistics, &c.</i>	265	APPENDIX II.— <i>Distribution of Land-Tax in England & Wales.—(Abstract of Table E, &c.)—Examples from 1636 to 1843</i>	305
PART II.—LAND-TAX STATISTICS, A.D. 1636-1798.			
§ 5.— <i>Review of the Political Arithmetic of Land-Tax questions during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, with special regard to the opinions of Sir John Sinclair, Sir Robert Walpole, Lord Halifax, Dr. Davenant, John Houghton, &c., including NEW CALCULATIONS and STATISTICS as to this period</i>	275		

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

§ 1.—*Explanation and Abstract of conclusions arrived at from the Statistics in Parts I and II of the Paper.*

IN bringing before the notice of the *Statistical Society* a topic so well adapted for discussion by that body as the *Land-Tax Assessment*, some indulgence must be claimed for the unavoidable imperfections of the present Essay upon the chief Statistical Questions which have been publicly mooted, at various times, respecting the territorial Distribution, the Redemption, and the Equalization, of the Tax.

The origin, progress, and condition of the Land-Tax are by no means so well known to the public generally as the like particulars of other Taxes; and this would, of itself, constitute a sufficient reason for

a close examination of facts and figures. But, in addressing the *Statistical Society*, as it includes many members who have an intimate knowledge of the whole subject, some hesitation is experienced in calling the attention of those members to a reconsideration of details which cannot, however, with any propriety, be omitted, if these questions are to be clearly defined to that portion of the Society to which they may not be quite so familiar.

Extending, as the programme does, over two Centuries, the risk of tediousness, if we adopt the strict chronological order of inquiry, is obvious enough on the one hand, whilst, on the other, in abandoning it, somewhat more discursiveness of remark has become essential. Hence the requirement of a general brief summary of the plan which has been followed in the ensuing statement, and of the conclusions to which, it is submitted, the Statistics now brought together in illustration of it, warrant us in arriving.

As it is possible that some may be inclined to read only as far as the end of these introductory remarks, it is proposed to include in them an anticipation of the several deductions which are more elaborately discussed in the body of the paper.

The object of its division into two parts will be to draw a line between (1) the *recent Statistics*, which are highly important in any public appreciation of projected measures for equalizing the Land-Tax, or for altering the terms of its Redemption; and (2) the earlier *Statistics*, or *Political Arithmetic*, of its original settlement, which have had a marked degree of constitutional importance, and are not, as might at first be supposed, out of place in reference even to the present time. And the separation of the details, in the manner explained, will at least be satisfactory to those who differ in this view, as they can conveniently cease their perusal of the paper at the end of the First Part.

In PART I, the History of the Land-Tax still in force is sketched; and the steps are shown by which its Assessment, in 1692 (under the Act of 4 William and Mary), has descended to the present time, and whereby, from having been, at the outset, a Tax of *One-Fifth Part*, or 20 *Per Cent.*, upon the Income from Real Property and from certain Offices and Pensions, and of *One-Twentieth Part*, or 5 *Per Cent.*, upon a limited amount of Personal Property, it has at length fallen to *about One-Hundredth Part*, i. e., under 1 *Per Cent.* of the annual value upon Real Property alone. These are the amounts for England and Wales, of which parts of the United Kingdom the Statistics, on this occasion, are more particularly inquired into, the Land-Tax for Scotland being so light (under One Part in Three Hundred and Thirty-Three of the Real Property Valuation) as scarcely to be worthy of the name of a Tax, and Ireland being altogether exempt from it.

The Revenue from the Tax amounted to 2,037,627*l.* in 1798, and to 1,161,201*l.* gross in 1856, including *Scotland*.

The course of the Redemption, under the Acts of 1798, 1802, and 1853, is then traced; and it is submitted, that it presents no evidence to prove that the price of the Funds either does, or ought

to, influence the slow rate at which the Redemption now proceeds—the activity of Mr. Pitt's measure having been promoted at the outset of it by entirely exceptional causes.

Calculations and observations are next given (*Vide* TABLE A) to show the proportions of Land-Tax, Redeemed and Unredeemed, between the years 1798 and 1843, in all parts of the country, arranged according to the modern *chorographical system* of Groups, or Divisions, of Counties.

In a subsequent part of the paper, the details are brought down to the latest date to which figures, as the basis of the Estimate, are available in a published form, as regards the amount redeemed in various Counties, viz., to 1849, but the differences between them, and the figures of 1843, are very inconsiderable.

After pointing out the chief observable circumstances in the proportions redeemed and unredeemed in different parts of the country, *the effects of the legislation of 1853 are particularly inquired into, and some remarks are made upon the Evidence on Land-Tax Statistics taken in 1836 by the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Agricultural Distress, and also upon the Evidence taken, on the same subject, by the Select Committee of the House of Lords, in 1846, upon the Burdens on Real Property.*

And it is contended that error exists in the whole of the Statistics submitted by Messrs. Wood and Garnett on those occasions, and that most of the deductions which have been made from those Statistics, both in and out of Parliament, have not taken due cognizance of the allowance that ought to be noted for the proportions of Land-Tax Redeemed, and which averaged (even in 1843) about 39 Per Cent. throughout England and Wales, and above 50 Per Cent., or more than One-Half Redeemed, in many Counties. And it follows that, upon this view of the subject, the results of the official Statistics of 1846, for the year 1843, presented errors, averaging an excess, in the figures of Rates in the Pound, of 39 Per Cent; and that the Statistics of 1836 were, from like and other causes, also erroneous.

This part of the Paper (*Vide* TABLE C, *Remarks*, &c.) concludes with an examination of the statements that were, in chief measure, based on these Statistics, in the Report of the Committee of the House of Lords.

In briefly noticing the objects of propositions respecting Land-Tax which, from time to time, have been introduced to the notice of Parliament down to the present Session, it is suggested that, neither statistically, nor much less constitutionally, can the Tax at the present time be proved to be inequitable or oppressive; and that there is no sufficient ground for advancing that it is advisable, either upon statistical evidence or upon any other kind of induction, to attempt to equalize an assessment of the exceptional character of the Land-Tax.

Upon the latter point, of assumed necessity for equalization,—so frequently brought before the notice of the public,—an Abstract of the figures, arranged in Divisions or Groups of Counties, is given (*Vide* APPENDIX II); and it is shown that, whilst the average Tax in England and Wales does not exceed Three Pence in the Pound, or $1\frac{1}{4}$ Per Cent., on the value of Real Property (which is likewise the rate for London and Middlesex), in no Division does the maxi-

imum Assessment range above Six Pence in the Pound, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ Per Cent. These two examples show that, in the Groups of Counties the reduction of the original Quotas of Assessment has been such as to bring down the present Quotas of *Unredeemed Tax* to an average of One Sixteenth Part of the before-mentioned original proportionate Quotas of 1692. The *maximum* diminution has been, in the two North-Western and Northern Divisions, viz., a reduction to One-Sixty-Fourth Part of the original Quotas of Assessment; and the *minimum* diminution has taken place in the two South Midland and Eastern Divisions, viz., a reduction to One-Eighth Part of the original Quotas of assessment.

An argument, which has been assiduously urged, that, when the Assessments are traced into their proportions as between County and County, strong appeals for the desirableness of equalization are warranted by the figures, is held not to be of much importance, as the very highest assessments upon any of the Counties, in proportion to the value of Real Property, are, when duly corrected for the amounts of Tax Redeemed, shown not to exceed Eight Pence Halfpenny in the Pound—the Three highest assessments, in 1843, having been, in Bedford $8\frac{1}{2}d.$, Buckingham $8d.$, and Suffolk $7d.$ in the Pound.

The arguments in favour of equalization have usually been overstrained into drawing distinctions between what one Parish, or section of a Parish, pays as compared with another. But, even in such minute Statistics, the large error of admitting into the calculation the *Redeemed* portion of the Tax as well as the portion *Unredeemed* and actually payable, has generally been fallen into. Apart, too, from this objection, analysis of such comparisons is not called for, unless we be ready to stand on the socialist ground of a common level; for the chain of reasoning upon this kind of Statistics might at length be pursued, not only from street to street, but from house to house, and even from floor to floor in the case of separate ownership of apartments or flats.*

The Act of 1798 made the Land-Tax perpetual, and prevented its expansion. It wisely fixed a maximum assessment on each district. It afforded the Landowner the power, if he possessed the pecuniary means, of getting rid of the assessment altogether; and it virtually gave a Premium to the improving Landlord to keep his improving Rent wholly beyond the scope of the Tax. Its effect was to require a given amount of Tax from each district so long as that amount, or a part of it, is unredeemed, and to the extent only of the portion unredeemed. The contributories to be the owners of Land upon which the Tax has not been redeemed, leaving the Land-Tax Commissioners to apportion it amongst those owners in the respective proportions of their incomes from the Real Property of Land and Tenements subject to the Tax.

If inequity exist here, as well as inequality, it is only of the same imaginary nature as in the case of Copyholders, the sole difference being that Copyholders have inherited or purchased their estates subject to a fixed charge to the Lord of the Manor, which charge admits of being redeemed, but *not of being redistributed* between the fellow

* Vide clause 38 of Act 38 Geo. III., c. 5, as to inhabitants of apartments, &c., in Somerset House, being assessable in the same proportion with those of Lancaster Liberty.

Copyholders of the Manor; whilst, in the parallel case of Contributories to the Land-Tax, they have inherited or purchased their Estates subject to a fixed charge payable to the State, and which admits both of redemption *and of redistribution* between themselves and their fellow contributories to the Land-Tax within the district of assessment.

The arguments before adverted to, as directed against the present incidence of the Land-Tax, have, as their assumed foundation, the comparative largeness of the present Assessment in certain exceptional instances, of which a great deal too much has been made, particularly as they have proceeded from erroneous Statistics.

But there is another class of arguments for equalization resting upon the somewhat jealous footing of the very low rate at which some particular parts of the country contribute to the Land-Tax. This class may best be illustrated by an example or two.

Taking, for instance, the three Ridings of York (or York Division), and the Counties of Chester and Lancashire (or North-Western Division), as the most prominent or remarkable specimens of a low rate of Tax, the plea is, that an equalization of Land-Tax is called for, because the former (York Division) pays about Three Half-Pence in the Pound of Land-Tax, which is *Half the average of Three Pence in the Pound for England and Wales*, and because the latter (North-Western Division) pays under Three Farthings in the Pound, or only *One Quarter of the average of England and Wales*.

And then, continuing the subdivision, the example of the modern city of Liverpool, paying a very small fraction of a farthing in the Pound, is very much insisted on by the advocates of this method of reasoning. And yet, as a deduction of inequity from inequality, it has about as much real foundation as if a Copyholder who has redeemed the Fines upon part of his Estate, and improved his Estate as regards its Income-producing power, say from the condition of a Rural Property, to what our colonial friends would call a "Town Lot," were to be legitimately a subject of envy to his fellow Copyholders. If we admit him to be so, the latter might fairly, as well as socially, be entitled to say to the Lord of the Manor, that an equalized Fine should be assessed between the Copyholders, who had partly redeemed, and themselves, as the other Copyholders on the Rent or Court-Roll of the Manor.

In drawing this analogy between the two positions, we have taken the lowest ground; for there remains the higher ground of objection, that an equalization would be ignoring the constitutional origin of the Land-Tax, which, as regards the particular examples last referred to, may be observed to have had its rise in times long antecedent to those in which has occurred the remarkable progress in industrial wealth that has during the last Century so pre-eminently distinguished the Counties of England situate North of the Trent.

And, it need scarcely be repeated, the taxed community receives a very full benefit from this progress, in the shape of the contributions of those counties to direct and indirect taxation in proportion to their present augmented means.

Measures,—well-intended, doubtless,—have been suggested in recent Sessions of Parliament *for making the terms of redemption easier to the Landlord*; but, in the course of the present inquiry, it

has been an object to consider whether such propositions would not, if carried out, give rise to greater inequity; and also to endeavour to point out that the operation of redemption is nothing more nor less than a *Clearing-House transaction for extinguishing a certain amount of Liability to pay to the State a perpetual Land-Tax, in exchange for the Liability of the State to pay the Fundholder a certain amount of perpetual Interest on its Funded Debt.*

This fact is hereafter explained at greater length, but these few words as truly describe it. And as to any objection that the terms of the Land-Tax Redemption Acts, from 1798 to 1853, required a Transfer of Twenty-Two Shillings of Dividend for every Twenty Shillings of Tax Redeemed, it is held that this was a just condition because there are expenses to defray, and because there are several collateral advantages secured to the purchaser of Land-Tax.

The extent of the Loss accruing to the Revenue since 1853, from the amended rates of Redemption under the Act of 16 and 17 Victoria, cap. 74, are fully inquired into and explained in the course of the paper, and the grounds are detailed on which it is estimated that a somewhat uncalled-for loss of from Six to Seven Million Pounds Sterling will eventually be sustained by the Revenue if the operation of that Act continue until all the Land-Tax now Unredeemed shall have been purchased and cancelled. And it is also shown that, if the proposition submitted to the House of Commons, in 1856, for affording greater facilities of Redemption, had been carried out, a further Loss of about an equal amount would also have been experienced.

The subject of the *earlier Statistics, or Political Arithmetic*, of the Land-Tax, and of the important deductions to be made from them, if we are to rightly appreciate the Land-Tax Measures of public men, as Ministers of State, as Members of the Legislature, or as Writers, —from the Revolution downwards,—is one not wanting in difficulty; and all that has been attempted on the present occasion is to give a Sketch which may prompt a more complete Essay on it by some future writer who is qualified for such a task.

The Sketch in question is comprised in PART II. of this Paper.

In it are traced the opinions on the inequity of the Land-Tax, as urged in opposition to the measure introduced by Mr. Pitt in 1798, which became law under the Act 38 Geo. III, c. 60. These opinions, of which the late Sir John Sinclair was the chief exponent, are shown to have been substantially little else than a fresh version of the arguments used by Sir Robert Walpole, in 1732, upon the occasion of his motion for the revival of the Salt Duty, when he insisted on the *grievousness, the unequalness, and the exceeding oppression of this Tax*, on the claims of the Landed Gentry upon the commiseration and protection of the country, and on the partiality of the impost, as falling, with a crushing weight, upon that section of the country gentlemen whose ancestors had been instrumental in the accomplishment of the Revolution of 1688,—and whom the minister seemed to describe as the only pecuniarily honest people in the kingdom.

The probable motive and inspiration of these sentiments then become subject of inquiry, with the view of testing *Whether there*

was the support of statistical facts? No trace of the latter can be discovered beyond the repetition of the remark of gross inequity, from one authority to another, in the limited number of those writers who, previously to the time of Sir R. Walpole, had illustrated fiscal questions statistically, and whose writings certainly had a considerable hold upon public opinion. Walpole may, of course, have been convinced by these statements, or been willingly content to take them for granted, but there is no appearance of his having himself made original research into the facts. And his argument has infinitely more of the impress of an appeal to party feeling than to deliberate judgment on evidence.

In order to connect the statements of Sir R. Walpole with those of the political arithmeticians who were contemporaries with the settlement of the Tax at the period of the revolutionary establishment, it became necessary, at this portion of our inquiry, to give as short a *résumé* as possible of the ancient origin of the Land-Tax from Saxon and Norman times down to the period of the Commonwealth, particularly as illustrative of the exceptional circumstances under which the Northern and Western Counties, having special burdens of their own, were in remote periods more prone to opposition to Land-Taxes than the other Counties.

This must have had a great deal to do with the almost traditional outcry against the absence of fair dealing in Land-Tax matters, and consequently against the integrity of the gentry of those Counties and of their Parliamentary Representatives. Such a description of clamour was based upon, even *primâ facie*, an improbable foundation. It presupposes a constant majority in the Land-Tax Commissions, as well as in the Senate, bent on perpetrating and perpetuating an injustice on their neighbours for the most paltry of considerations. It also supposes a somnolent and passive minority—rather a remarkable phenomenon in English history. And, in fine, it would argue an indifference to the manner in which nearly 40 Per Cent. of the whole of the National Revenue was derived, this having been about the Per-Centage borne by the Land-Tax to the whole Taxation, from the outset of the Commonwealth down to the time of William and Mary, during whose reigns it was about 39 Per Cent.

In one point of view, Dr. Davenant may be considered as having much contributed to the formation of popular opinion on the inequity of the Tax. This author, now more generally known by name than from perusal of his writings, was many years in Parliament before his appointment as Inspector-General of Customs. He had a decided bias towards exclusive indirect taxation, and it was comparatively easy for him to argue, with repeated appeals to some ill-arranged figures, not properly subjected to calculation; and to harp upon the old string, to which the public had been somewhat used, of the extremely partial dealing of the Northern and Western Counties,—an idea, to some extent, traditionally acquired from the recollection of the Land-Tax Rebellions of Yorkshire and Durham in 1489 and of Cornwall in 1497, rebellions which, after all, arose out of the reasons for the imposition of the Tax, and not out of the inequity of its distribution.

The views entertained upon the Land-Tax question by Sir William Petty, the Marquis of Halifax, John Houghton, and by Dave-

nant himself, are next made the subject of investigation; and it is submitted that the opinions of the two last-mentioned authors, published in 1693 and 1695, had more effect than those of any others in deeply influencing the impressions of the public, as proceeding upon the basis of statistical induction. On examining them, reasons for wholly dissenting from the method of applying that basis will be obvious to the modern inquirer; and the fact that Houghton and Dr. Davenant drew their conclusions of inequity of assessment more from the ratios of the Tax, calculated in specific relation to the *number of houses*, than from the true basis of value of Real Property, is enough to show that their judgment was warped into the wrong direction.

The views of Dr. Davenant are then subjected to minuter analysis: his figures are re-arranged into the modern form of Counties, classed into groups or Divisions. Calculations, which were not attempted by him, are made of the Per-Centage ratios in which each County and Division contributed to the whole Tax; and calculations are also annexed of Assessments for intermediate Years of the Seventeenth Century, upon which fresh information has been collected for the purpose of illustrating the inquiry as fully as possible. The general results of the carefully calculated Per-Centages are then combined into TABLE E, the two Sections of which present, in as complete a Form as is needful, the real operation of the Land-Tax at various periods from 1636 to 1843, and are carried down, in APPENDIX I, to the year 1849, being the latest date to which Returns are published for separate Counties.

This General TABLE E shows, as regards the Political Arithmetic of the Land-Tax in the Seventeenth Century, that *Davenant was in error* in his inferences from, and applications of, the data of the Ship Money Land-Tax Assessment of 1636, and of the projected Land-Tax Assessment of 1660 upon the abolition of the feudal prerogatives of the Crown exercised by the Court of Wards and Liveries.

TABLE E also plainly indicates that if we only admit the general equity of one of the Seventeenth Century Assessments (which are all reduced in the TABLE to the same standard of Per-Centages, for the purpose of immediate comparison with each other),—and Davenant himself was ready to admit the extreme correctness and equity of the two of them just referred to—*then the whole argument of gross injustice, and of partiality in their respective ratios, falls to pieces*,—as the proportions of the Tax borne by the respective Counties in various years are by no means so widely different as would justify the imputation of systematic unfairness.

The details are explained more at length in the concluding Sections of Part II of the Paper.

The leading conclusion upon the earlier period of the settlement of the Land-Tax is, that the territorial subdivision of its Assessment is statistically shown never to have presented those indications of extreme partiality and injustice in its Ratios during the Seventeenth Century, of which it has been so frequently accused by statesmen, and by those political arithmeticians and historians, who have relied rather on the mistaken conclusions of Davenant, and on the ideas handed down from one to another, that inequity existed,—than upon a more mature analysis of facts and figures.

PART I.—LAND-TAX STATISTICS, 1798 TO 1856.

§ 2.—*Legislation on Land-Tax Redemption.—Facts and Figures of its results, particularly from the period of Mr. Pitt's measure down to the present time.*

The British Land-Tax Assessment, under the settlement of 1798, has generally been admitted to be a subject of importance in financial and constitutional history. It is further remarkable as almost the only remaining link which connects the Statistics of Real Property at the present time with the Political Arithmetic of the Seventeenth Century.

The Quotas of Land-Tax assessed in 1692, by the Act 4 William and Mary, c. 1, upon the several Counties, Cities, Boroughs, Towns, and Places of Great Britain, are also nominally those which now exist. They have been continued—

(1). By *Annual Acts*, from 1692 to 1797, all upon the same model as regards the proportionate rates of contribution, but varying the amount of it from Four to Three Shillings in the Pound, and to Two Shillings in some years; and in two instances, viz., for the years 1732 and 1733, reducing it to One Shilling in the pound. These Assessments were upon Real Estate, hereditaments, offices, and pensions. Personal Estate was also brought within the scope of the Act by capitalization at 5 Per Cent., and Assessment at One-Fourth of the Rate on Real Property; but practically it was affected only to a very partial and limited extent. The last of the annual Acts was the 37 George III., c. 5, for granting an Aid to his Majesty by a Land-Tax, to be raised in Great Britain for the service of the year 1798.

(2). By the *Statute* 38 George III., c. 60 (known as the Land-Tax Redemption Act of 1798), which made perpetual the Land-Tax Quotas of the last Annual Act. These, it declared, are to be raised in every year for ever; and, whilst it thus in form perpetuated the impost, it provided methods for its eventual extinction, *by redemption or purchase, i. e., upon transfer to the Government of a consideration to be estimated, in each case, at so much Stock, in Three Per Cent. Consols or Reduced, as will produce a Dividend exceeding, by One-Tenth, the amount of the Land-Tax redeemed.* In other words, a transfer of One Pound Two Shillings of Gross Dividend from perpetual Stock was to be taken in cancelment of One Pound of Net Perpetual charge on Land, the difference of Two Shillings being for expenses of carrying out the measure.*

Under the operation of this perpetuating Act,—although the amount of the Real Property assessment *nominally* remains at the same sum as in the year 1798, which, in turn, had been inherited from its condition in the year 1692, viz. (omitting Shillings and Pence and excluding Scotland), at 1,989,673*l.* for England and Wales,—it had been *really* reduced, on the 25th March, 1849, to the sum of 1,128,177*l.* for that part of the United Kingdom.

The difference between these two sums, or 861,496*l.*, was the

* The amendment in Redemption Terms (per Act 16 and 17 Vict., c. 74,) will be hereafter referred to.

amount written off in the Half Century 1798-1849. And, of this total reduction, 730,747*l.* ceased by redemption or purchase;* 5,214*l.* by cessation of Tax on Personal Estate, the Assessment to the Land-Tax under this category having been repealed in 1834;† and the remaining 125,535*l.* by cessation, after expiry of the annual Acts, of the partial incidence of the Land-Tax on Offices and Pensions.

The aggregate gross reduction from all causes may, therefore, be reckoned at about 43½ Per Cent. in 1849, or probably at about 44 Per Cent. for the present date (May, 1857).‡

The most recent return of the Quotas of Land-Tax Assessment on Real Property exclusively, as arising out of the settlement of 1798, and of the Sums under the heads of Land-Tax Redeemed and Unredeemed *for each of the several Counties*, is contained in No. 619 of the House of Commons' Papers of 1844. This return extends to the 25th March, 1843; and, although, so far as regards the Items of Tax redeemed, the figures at end of six years later, or at 25th March, 1849, may be obtained from No. 625 of the Commons' Papers of 1849, it will be preferable to analyse the earlier of the two Returns, although the particulars of the later one are also given in APPENDIX I.

The alterations from fresh redemptions which took place between 1843 and 1849 amount to 6,283*l.* only in the six years, a proportion too insignificant, upon so large an Item as the aggregate Land-Tax payable, to materially affect such inductions as may now be arrived at from those figures of the year 1843 as applicable, with sufficient nearness to the existing status of the Tax in the several Counties of England and Wales, besides which the figures for 1843 will be especially serviceable in examining the other Statistics to be referred to in continuation.

As the Return for 1843 gives merely the figures of Land-Tax Redeemed, Unredeemed, and Total, for the Fifty-Two Counties, arranged alphabetically, it has been found desirable to re-arrange them on the present occasion according to the more useful and instructive modern Chorographical System of Groups or Divisions, and,—which has not previously been attempted,—to calculate for each County and Group, or Division, of Counties, the ratios borne by the Quotas of Land-Tax, Redeemed and Unredeemed, to each other, and to the Total nominal assessments. The following TABLE A contains the Results:—

* See Return to Address of House of Commons, 28th July, 1849. No. 625, p. 18.

† Per Act 3 Will. IV., c. 12.

‡ These are the amounts for *England and Wales*. The aggregate nominal Tax for Great Britain, under the settlements 1692 and 1798, was (omitting Shillings and Pence) 2,037,627*l.*, of which 1,989,673*l.*, or 97¾ Per Cent. of the total, upon England and Wales; and only 47,954*l.*, or 2½ Per Cent. of the total, upon Scotland.

TABLE B, in a subsequent part of this Paper, will show the progress of Redemption, under the Act of 1798, arranged in separate years.

TABLE A.

LAND-TAX REDEEMED AND UNREDEEMED in each COUNTY of ENGLAND AND WALES,
as at 25TH MARCH, 1843.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Names of		Land-Tax	Land-Tax	Total, or Nominal Assessment.	Proportion of Land-Tax Redeemed to Total or Nominal Assessment.	Proportion of Land-Tax Unre- deemed to Total or Nominal Assessment.
DIVISIONS.	COUNTIES.	Redeemed.	Unre- deemed.	(Col. 3 + col. 4.)		
		£	£	£	Per Cent.	Per Cent.
I.—LONDON AND MID- DLESEX	{Middlesex, includ- ing London and Westminster	87,794	148,455	236,249	37·2	62·8
II.—SOUTH-EASTERN	{Surrey	28,596	36,514	65,110	43·9	56·1
	{Kent	42,785	37,710	80,495	53·1	46·9
	{Sussex	27,425	30,974	58,399	46·9	53·1
	{Hampshire	25,564	27,033	52,597	48·6	51·4
	{Berkshire	19,036	21,162	40,198	47·3	52·7
	Total of 5 Counties	143,406	153,393	296,799	48·3	51·7
III.—SOUTH MIDLAND	{Hertfordshire	21,018	20,766	41,784	50·3	49·7
	{Buckingham	21,412	25,407	46,819	45·7	54·3
	{Oxfordshire	14,898	23,229	38,127	39·1	60·9
	{Northampton	14,807	32,352	47,159	31·4	68·6
	{Huntingdon	4,276	11,003	15,279	28·0	72·0
	{Bedford	9,865	18,568	28,433	34·7	65·3
	{Cambridge	9,455	23,008	32,463	29·1	70·9
	Total of 7 Counties Middlesex excluded)	95,731	154,333	250,064	38·3	61·7
IV.—EASTERN	{Essex	46,560	42,087	88,647	52·5	47·5
	{Suffolk	22,755	49,745	72,500	31·4	68·6
	{Norfolk	19,335	62,485	81,820	23·6	76·4
	Total of 3 Counties	88,650	154,317	242,967	36·5	63·5
V.—SOUTH-WESTERN	{Wiltshire	20,451	30,537	50,988	40·1	59·9
	{Dorsetshire	10,521	21,506	32,027	32·9	67·1
	{Devonshire	29,201	48,572	77,773	37·5	62·5
	{Cornwall	12,373	18,105	30,478	40·6	59·4
	{Somerset	24,737	45,165	69,902	35·4	64·6
	Total of 5 Counties	97,283	163,885	261,168	37·2	62·8
VI.—WEST MIDLAND...	{Gloucester	19,765	26,892	46,657	42·4	57·6
	{Hereford	7,343	12,763	20,106	36·5	63·5
	{Shropshire	7,778	20,906	28,684	27·1	72·9
	{Stafford	9,808	16,332	26,140	37·5	62·5
	{Worcester	12,784	19,627	32,411	39·4	60·6
	{Warwick	15,312	23,794	39,106	39·1	60·9
	Total of 6 Counties	72,790	120,314	193,104	37·7	62·3

TABLE A.—Continued.
LAND-TAX REDEEMED AND UNREDEEMED in ENGLAND AND WALES, as at
25TH MARCH, 1843.

1		2	3	4	5	6	7
Names of		Land-Tax Redeemed.	Land-Tax Unre- deemed.	Total, or Nominal Assessment. (Col. 3 + col. 4.)	Proportion of Land-Tax Redeemed to Total or Nominal Assessment.	Proportion of Land-Tax Unre- deemed to Total or Nominal Assessment.	
DIVISIONS.	COUNTIES.						
VII.—NORTH MIDLAND	Leicester	£ 12,793	£ 21,446	£ 34,239	Per Cent. 37·4	Per Cent. 62·6	
	Rutland	1,236	4,237	5,473	22·5	77·5	
	Lincoln	19,056	51,493	70,549	27·0	73·0	
	Nottingham	9,160	17,573	26,733	34·2	65·8	
	Derby	7,071	16,333	23,404	30·2	69·8	
	<i>Total of 5 Counties</i>	49,316	111,082	160,398	30·8	69·2	
VIII.—NORTH-WESTN	Cheshire	7,707	19,769	27,476	28·0	72·0	
	Lancashire	8,046	11,361	19,407	41·5	58·5	
	<i>Total of 2 Counties</i>	15,753	31,130	46,883	33·6	66·4	
IX.—YORK	{ York, including North, East, and West Ridings }	44,402	44,004	88,406	50·2	49·8	
X.—NORTHERN	Durham	5,756	4,688	10,444	55·1	44·9	
	Northumberland	5,319	8,141	13,460	39·5	60·5	
	Cumberland	2,091	1,637	3,728	56·0	44·0	
	Westmoreland	1,780	1,251	3,031	58·7	41·3	
	<i>Total of 4 Counties</i>	14,946	15,717	30,663	48·8	51·2	
XI.—WELSH	Monmouth	3,030	6,582	9,612	31·5	68·5	
	<i>South Wales.</i>						
	Glamorgan	1,609	6,063	7,672	20·9	79·1	
	Carmarthen	1,186	2,963	4,149	28·6	71·4	
	Pembroke	1,281	1,622	2,903	44·1	55·9	
	Cardigan	397	882	1,279	31·0	69·0	
	Brecknock	942	2,013	2,955	31·9	68·1	
	Radnor	831	1,823	2,654	31·3	68·7	
	<i>North Wales.</i>						
	Montgomery	1,074	4,732	5,806	18·5	81·5	
	Flintshire	744	1,503	2,247	33·1	66·9	
	Denbigh	1,662	5,056	6,718	24·7	75·3	
	Merioneth	485	1,938	2,423	20·0	80·0	
	Carnarvon	607	1,666	2,273	26·7	73·3	
	Anglesey	549	987	1,536	35·7	64·3	
	<i>Total of 13 Counties</i>	14,397	37,830	52,227	27·6	72·4	
ENGLAND AND WALES	{ TOTAL OF 52 COUNTIES }	724,464	1,134,460	1,858,924	39·0	61·0	

It has already been observed that the proportion of Tax Redeemed in Great Britain, including all the Items originally subject to the Tax, now amounts to about 44 Per Cent.; but the preceding TABLE A refers to the Real Property Assessment exclusively, and to England and Wales only, where the Tax is shown to have been 39 Per Cent. Redeemed in 1843, leaving 61 Per Cent. Unredeemed.

An addition of about 1 Per Cent. to the former figure will show quite nearly enough the approximate amount applicable to the present date, *and this would make the Proportion of the Tax Redeemed under the category, above referred to of Real Property Assessment, about 40 Per Cent., or Two-Fifths; and the proportion Unredeemed 60 Per Cent., or Three-Fifths.*

Restricting more minute notice to the English Counties, the *maximum* ratio of Land-Tax redeemed to unredeemed is shown by Table, as occurring in Westmoreland, viz., nearly 59 Per Cent.; and it will also be seen in the Table that the ratio in Cumberland, Durham, Kent, Essex, Hertfordshire, Yorkshire, came next in order, the proportion redeemed in each case exceeding 50 Per Cent.

Middlesex, including *London and Westminster*, does not present a larger per-centage of Redemption than about 38 Per Cent., which is about 2 Per Cent. inferior to the average for England and Wales.

As the per-centage for each County is distinctly shown in the Table, we need only add that the *minimum* ratio of redemption in English Counties is in Rutland, viz., about 23 Per Cent.; and that the Counties of Norfolk, Lincoln, Salop, Cheshire, Huntingdon, Cambridge, approach, in order, nearest to this *minimum*, the ratio in each case being under 30 Per Cent.

It is further noticeable that, in a large majority of those Counties in which the amount of *real property* exceeded the average in its proportion to the population, the amount of Land-Tax redeemed is at the lower end of the scale; and, *vice versâ*, that, in the majority of those Counties in which the amount of *real property* is below the average in proportion to the population, the amount of Land-Tax redeemed is at the higher end of the scale.

Some interesting comparisons may be made between the proportions redeemed in various *groups* of counties. For example, in the Group of English Counties on which the nominal Assessment imposes the largest quota on real estate, viz., the South-Eastern Division, comprising, Surrey, Kent, Sussex, Hampshire, Berkshire, not only has the largest amount of Tax been redeemed, but the largest proportion to its *quota* of any of the more considerable of the assessments.

Of the groups of less considerable Assessment, the York Division, and the Northern Division of Durham, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, have even a still larger *proportion* of their quotas redeemed.

The North-Midland Division, comprising the Counties of Leicester, Rutland, Lincoln, Nottingham, Derby, has the least proportionate amount redeemed of any division in England.

The South-Western Division, comprising Wilts, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall, Somerset, corresponds in proportion redeemed with the London and Middlesex Division.

The following TABLE B contains the full particulars, or statement already referred to, as to the progress of the Redemption between the years 1798 and 1856:—

TABLE B.

REDEMPTION OF LAND-TAX IN GREAT BRITAIN,—SHOWING ITS ANNUAL PROGRESS FROM 1798 TO 1856; AND ITS EFFECT ON THE NATIONAL DEBT AND REVENUE.—GIVING ALSO THE AMOUNTS OF STOCK AND OF DIVIDEND OR INTEREST CANCELLED.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
YEARS.	Total Amounts of Land-Tax Redeemed.	Total Amounts of Dividend on Three Per Cent. Stock Cancelled.	Total Amounts of Three Per Cent. Stock Cancelled.	Average Prices of Three Per Cent. Stock.	Average Years' Purchase for Redemption of Land-Tax.	Total Gross Receipt of Land-Tax in each Year.
1798....	£	£	£	2,037,627
1799 {	435,888 1½ Year from 5 July, 1798	391,788 1½ Year from 5 July, 1798	13,059,587 1½ Year from 5 July, 1798	56½	20·7	1,642,301
1800....	40,418	91,026	3,034,215	63½	23·1	1,656,610
	476,306	482,814	16,093,802			
1801....	33,287	57,220	1,907,346	61½	22·5	1,552,782
1802....	16,470	35,383	1,179,439	70	25·7	1,580,888
	526,063	575,417	19,180,587			
1803....	55,819	59,019	1,967,302	57½	20·9	1,506,238
1804....	16,748	19,393	646,419	56½	20·8	1,467,284
1805....	12,915	15,943	531,432	58¾	21·5	1,536,482
1806....	12,993	11,731	591,046	61½	22·4	1,451,773
1807....	9,293	7,802	260,043	62½	23·0	1,432,790
1808....	6,619	7,127	237,566	66¾	24·3	1,582,734
1809....	6,550	6,212	207,072	68¾	25·2	1,511,955
1810....	7,324	8,539	284,623	67	24·6	1,418,337
1811....	7,472	7,049	234,965	63¾	23·4	1,333,432
1812....	11,554	13,132	437,747	59	21·6	1,368,128
	673,350	731,364	24,378,802			
1813....	6,987	7,652	255,076	59½	21·7	1,303,400
1814....	10,605	9,793	326,432	66¾	24·4	1,295,983
1815....	5,127	5,842	194,743	59	21·6	1,195,974
1816....	3,485	4,078	135,937	61½	22·7	1,234,418
1817....	3,235	2,947	98,239	75½	27·6	1,245,343
1818....	4,299	3,386	112,860	78½	28·6	1,272,474
1819....	2,802	4,027	134,225	71½	26·2	1,293,714
1820....	2,241	2,696	89,883	68¾	25·1	1,203,716
1821....	2,231	2,787	92,888	74½	27·4	1,281,335
1822....	2,153	2,728	90,935	79½	29·1	1,186,464
	716,515	777,300	25,910,020			

TABLE B.—Continued.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
YEARS.	Total Amounts of Land-Tax Redeemed.	Total Amounts of Dividend on Three Per Cent. Stock Cancelled.	Total Amounts of Three Per Cent. Stock Cancelled.	Average Prices of Three Per Cent. Stock.	Average Years' Purchase for Redemp- tion of Land-Tax.	Total Gross Receipt of Land-Tax in each Year.
	£	£	£			£
1823 ...	1,588	2,011	67,055	79 $\frac{5}{8}$	29·2	1,245,960
1824 ...	1,690	2,111	70,367	93 $\frac{5}{8}$	34·3	1,292,462
1825 ...	1,210	1,759	58,665	90 $\frac{1}{4}$	33·1	1,275,255
1826 ...	1,864	2,399	79,990	79 $\frac{1}{2}$	29·1	1,245,056
1827 ...	1,848	2,444	81,467	84 $\frac{3}{8}$	30·9	1,274,184
1828 ...	1,497	1,603	53,448	85 $\frac{5}{8}$	31·4	1,216,160
1829 ...	1,143	1,785	59,528	88 $\frac{5}{8}$	32·5	1,206,085
1830 ...	1,134	1,453	48,327	89 $\frac{3}{8}$	32·8	1,190,704
1831 ...	1,593	1,546	51,510	80 $\frac{7}{8}$	29·6	1,167,167
1832 ..	902	1,185	39,507	83 $\frac{3}{8}$	30·6	1,189,860
	730,984	795,596	26,519,884			
1833 ...	1,277	1,186	39,541	88 $\frac{1}{8}$	32·3	1,160,275
1834 ...	705	1,204	40,147	90 $\frac{5}{8}$	33·3	1,208,378
1835 ...	952	1,223	40,744	91 $\frac{1}{4}$	33·5	1,203,747
1836 ...	959	1,384	46,135	90 $\frac{3}{8}$	33·1	1,203,632
1837 ...	990	1,685	56,182	91 $\frac{3}{8}$	33·5	1,196,991
1838 ...	2,520	2,135	71,157	93 $\frac{1}{2}$	34·3	1,188,417
1839 ...	3,395	3,706	123,545	91 $\frac{1}{4}$	33·7	1,178,963
1840 ...	1,159	1,540	51,318	89 $\frac{7}{8}$	33·0	1,185,586
1841 ...	1,242	1,242	41,402	89 $\frac{3}{8}$	32·8	1,218,576
1842 ...	657	802	26,723	91 $\frac{1}{4}$	33·6	1,172,531
	744,840	811,703	27,056,778			
1843 ...	566	749	24,976	95 $\frac{3}{8}$	35·0	1,162,632
1844 ...	1,049	873	29,087	99 $\frac{1}{8}$	36·3	1,166,690
1845 ...	766	1,061	35,364	98 $\frac{3}{8}$	36·1	1,164,503
1846 ...	763	588	19,610	95 $\frac{5}{8}$	35·1	1,170,106
1847 ...	1,382	1,596	53,215	87 $\frac{1}{4}$	32·0	1,158,784
1848 ..	1,179	1,331	44,377	85 $\frac{3}{8}$	31·3	1,162,427
1849 ...	589	876	29,190	92 $\frac{3}{8}$	33·9	1,162,768
1850 ...	995	1,020	34,001	96 $\frac{3}{8}$	35·3	1,163,024
1851 ...	900	958	31,927	96 $\frac{1}{4}$	35·5	1,147,492
1852 ...	1,457	1,296	43,193	99 $\frac{1}{4}$	36·4	1,156,046
	754,486	822,051	27,401,718			
1853 ..	7,814	5,478	182,589	96 $\frac{3}{4}$	35·@29·	1,150,403
		4,874	162,459			
1854 ...	2,893	5 Jan. '54. to 31 Mar. '55.	5 Jan. '54. to 31 Mar. '55.	91 $\frac{5}{8}$	27·7	1,159,311
1855 ...	2,728	2,427 31 Mar. '55 to '56.	80,906 31 Mar. '55 to '56.	90	27·2	1,161,201
Totals, 1798 to 1855	767,921	834,830	27,827,672
1856 ...	1,724
	769,645

The preceding TABLE B may be found useful in ascertaining, with sufficient nearness, the correctness, or the contrary, of many Statistics which have from time to time been submitted, and will continue to be so, to public notice, upon occasions when Land-Tax questions have been, or will be, discussed. For example, whilst these remarks have been set aside for printing, Mr. Mackinnon, in moving (on the 28th May, 1857), for a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Land-Tax, stated to the House, that:—

“In 1798 the funds were at 60, and Mr. Pitt devised a very “ingenious mode of raising money. In 1798, under the Act for “redeeming the Land-Tax passed by Mr. Pitt, out of an annual “revenue arising from Land-Tax of 1,925,000*l.* a-year, 772,500*l.* was “redeemed at the rate fixed, viz., 32 years’ purchase, by which “Mr. Pitt realized a present receipt of 21,750,000*l.*”

If the Hon. Gentleman’s figures, as above quoted, are reported correctly, they are very wide of the mark, as will be seen by comparison with the TABLE B. Apart, too, from the question of figures, it would appear that there was a misconception on his part—(both on this occasion and previously, viz., on the 18th July, 1856, *vide* Hansard, vol. cxliii.)—of the intentions, as well as of the effect, of Mr. Pitt’s policy respecting the Land-Tax. The *intentions* of that Statesman were twofold. *First*, to make a permanent settlement, once for all, of the amount and quotas of the Tax. *Secondly*, to allow of its exchange, on fixed terms, in cancelment of a fixed amount of Dividend on Three Per Cent. Stock, and, by means of such an operation, to endeavour to keep up the price of the Funds at a period when the patriotism and the circumstances of the community required it. And the *effect* of this financial operation was, that the Transfers of Stock (which were for some time allowed to be made in instalments) carried out the main ultimate object of the measure, namely, an increase in the price of the Funds, so far as it could be influenced by augmentation in the number of purchasers, and by reduction in the amount of stock in the market, such reduction being consequent on the cancelments carried out upon each Redemption of the Land-Tax.

The operation does not come within the category of money-raising. It is true that, under the provisions of the Acts (38 Geo. III., c. 60, and 42 Geo. III., c. 116), some money-payments were received in place of transfers of Stock, or rather as equivalents to the price of the latter; but the money was paid to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, “on account of sale of Land-Tax,” and was applied in purchase of Three Per Cent. Stock; and it will be seen by inspection of the Annual Finance Accounts, that the proportion of money paid to Stock transferred by the public was small.

The data in the preceding TABLE B *afford irrefutable evidence that the common opinion, as to the price of the Funds having had a direct and constant influence upon the amount of Land-Tax Redeemed, is erroneous.* The figures of the fluctuations, from year to year (*Vide* Cols. 2, 5, and 6), give abundant examples of increase in the amount of Tax Redeemed following increase, quite as much as decrease, in the price of the Funds.

Col. 6 of this Table shows the average years’ purchase for

Redemption of Land-Tax, and is to be understood as the average price, through each of the 58½ years (1798-1856) corresponding with the purchase-money price of a Dividend on Three Per Cent. Stock, *altered* for the addition of *Ten Per Cent.* from 1798 to 1853 (per Act 38 Geo. III., c. 60), and for the *reduction of Nine and a Quarter Per Cent.* from 1853 to 1856 (per Act 16 and 17 Vict., c. 74). It will be observed that the minimum number of years' purchase was, in the first year and a half (1798-1799), from the introduction of the plan. During this time, the Three Per Cents. averaged 56½ per 100*l.* Stock; and the redemption price of Land-Tax was a fraction under 21 years' purchase. The sum of 435,888*l.* per Annum of Land-Tax was forthwith redeemed; and although the price of Three Per Cents was frequently as low between the years 1797 and 1815, the average amount redeemed at once fell to a comparatively small Sum.

This is best shown by the following brief epitome of the whole course of the Redemption from 1798 to 1856:—

ABSTRACT FROM TABLE B. LAND-TAX REDEEMED,—GREAT BRITAIN.

1	2	3	4	5
PERIODS.	Length of Periods.	Aggregate Amount of Land-Tax Redeemed in each Period.	Annual Average Amount Redeemed in each Period.	Average Years' Purchase of the Tax Paid on its Redemption.
1798 (from 5 July) 1799	1½ year	£ 435,888	£ 290,592	20·7
1800	1 „	40,418	40,418	23·1
1801 and 1802	2 years	49,757	24,878	22·5 @ 25·7
1803-1812 inclusive	10 „	147,287	14,729	20·8 @ 25·2
1813-1822 „	10 „	43,165	4,316	21·6 @ 29·1
1823-1832 „	10 „	14,469	1,447	29·1 @ 34·3
1833-1842 „	10 „	13,856	1,385	32·3 @ 34·3
1843-1852 „	10 „	9,646	965	31·3 @ 36·4
1853-1856 „	4 „	15,159	3,790	27·2 @ 35·
TOTAL TERM	58½ years	769,645	13,156	

The following general remarks occur as arising out of a consideration of the results in TABLE B, of which the preceding Abstract gives condensed particulars:—

(1).—*As to the large amount redeemed in the first year and a half (1798-9), viz., 435,888*l.*,—an amount greater by 102,131*l.* than the whole amount which has been redeemed in the subsequent aggregate period of 57 years (1800-1856), viz., 333,757*l.**

It cannot, with any pretension to soundness of argument, be

maintained that the price of the Funds in 1798-9 had so much to do with the amount redeemed, as other considerations. Apart from the desirableness, which was publicly acknowledged, of aiding the patriotic endeavours to keep up Credit through the price of the National Funded Debt, it must be recollected that, immediately the permission to redeem was granted, the great body of landed gentry who possessed Surplus Capital, and of improving landlords who were glad to be rid of the form and name of the charge of the Tax, disencumbered themselves forthwith. But their patriotism was not made to suffer a greater burden in this instance than from an investment of a further amount of capital in the buying of perpetual first charges upon Land at an average price of a little under 21 years' purchase.

And as, since that period, opportunities of investment in perpetual income from land, ground, and improved rents, &c., have not lacked purchasers at prices varying from 25 to 40 years' purchase, it directly follows that the dearness or cheapness of Land-Tax Redemption has been merely a conventional term, the ability to buy and the cost of purchase having advanced, or declined, *pari passu* from the same causes affecting other investments in land.

(2).—*As to fluctuations in the progress of the Redemption between the years 1799 and 1853.*

It will be noticed from the figures of TABLE B, and the Abstract of it, that the amounts Redeemed in 1800-1802 immediately fell to a comparatively small amount, without any increase of corresponding magnitude in the price of the Funds and purchase money of the Tax. But, on the 26th June, 1802, an Act of Parliament was passed (42 Geo. III., c. 116) for consolidating the Land-Tax Statutes and removing doubts respecting the right of persons claiming to vote at Elections for Members of Parliament in respect of real property, the Land-Tax upon which had been redeemed or purchased. Mr. Pitt, —in common with other persons who had attentively considered the subject,*—had originally been of opinion, that, to foster the success of the measure, it would be useful to encourage the purchase of Land-Tax as an investment by other parties besides the payers of the Tax. This plan was not, however, carried out in the legislation of 1798. It was reserved for the supplementary Act of 1802 above referred to, under the provisions of which, and down to the year 1853 (when they were so far repealed), the power of purchase or redemption was accorded to purchasers in open market at the highest bidding above what might be offered in addition to the upset price by the original payer of the Tax. The State thus put the purchaser into its place, by conveying to him the right to receive Land-Tax as a Fee-Farm Rent, and further entitling him to the Electoral Suffrage when the Tax purchased amounted to the adequate sum.

The number of Votes thus acquired in the Fifty Years over which the operation extended cannot, perhaps, be ascertained; but the

* For remarks, by the writer of this paper, on Sir F. M. Eden's views upon this point in 1799, see the "Assurance Magazine" for 1854, vol. iv., pp. 314, &c., "Review of the First Parliamentary Committee of Insurance."

whole number of contracts so entered into by strangers, *i. e.*, by persons other than those chargeable to the Tax purchased, is, according to the statement of the Inland Revenue Commissioners, only 2,073. The stimulus given to the extent of purchases would appear to have been quite temporary, viz., in the year 1803, when the amount redeemed increased to 55,819*l.*, as against 16,470*l.* in the previous year. But in the next succeeding year, viz., in 1804, the amount redeemed again fell to nearly as low an amount as before, viz., to 16,748*l.*

From the latter date it continued to decline, until it reached a minimum amount, redeemed in one year, of 566*l.* in 1843. At an intervening period, viz., between 1815 and 1818, an attempt was made to give a stimulus to redemption by affording very favourable terms in the exceptional instance of payers of Land-Tax on Rents arising from Land or Tenements not exceeding One Quarter of an Acre in extent. These terms were 18 years' purchase, or about from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $10\frac{1}{2}$ years' purchase less than the current general terms of redemption. This Act commenced in 1813; but the Tax Redeemed in that year was, notwithstanding, 4,567*l.* less than in 1812. It recovered, however, under the temporary effect of this stimulus to within 749*l.*, in 1814, of what it had been in 1812; but, between 1815 and 1818 (at the latter of which dates the regulation expired), it again fell to 6,427*l.* less in 1815, 8,069*l.* less in 1816, 8,319*l.* less in 1817, and 7,255*l.* less in 1818, than the amount at which it had stood in 1812.

(3).—*As to the Progress of the Redemption of Land-Tax between 1853 and 1856.—Effects of Mr. Gladstone's Measure.*

From what has already been stated, it can scarcely fail to be perceived how ineffectual and futile had been attempts to give an artificial stimulus to the progress of the Redemption, between the period of the exceptional circumstances at the outset of the measure in 1798 and the recent date of 1853.

It may be doubted whether even a *prima facie* case of need of alteration has ever been fairly made out; and, if it were, the view taken by Sir George Cornewall Lewis, that, in any reduction of the terms of redemption to those who are paying, those who had redeemed, having done so at the higher rate, would suffer an injustice, is worthy of all respect, and of general acquiescence.

Whether the sentiments on the subject of Land-Tax that were expressed in the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, which sat in 1846,* induced a revival, in 1853, of a belief, that an artificial stimulus, which had been tried and found to fail, would lead to a different result, if then applied, is at least an open question. But this much is certain, that the experience of the last four years has confirmed the utter inadequacy of the change then carried out; and its advisability and equity are not only questionable, upon the view just adverted to as taken by Sir G. C. Lewis, but the disturbance of the terms of the Redemption Conditions of 1798, by the Act of 16 and 17 Vict., c. 74, which took effect from

* *Viz: The Committee upon Burdens affecting Real Property, referred to at greater length in a subsequent section of this paper.*

the 15th August, 1853, has been proved, by its utter want of success, to be eminently uncalled for.

The First Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue on the Inland Revenue, recently printed—(May, 1857)—gives the authoritative statement, that “even the great reduction of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the price of redemption, by the Act 16 and 17 Victoria, “has not been attended with the effect that might have been anticipated; for, after the first year in which it came into operation “(1853), the amount redeemed in each year has been under 3,000*l*. “And” (the Commissioners add) “the burden of the Land-Tax is in “general so trivial, that probably the riddance of the charge by “redemption is not regarded as an object of sufficient importance to “repay the trouble of the proceeding, except under peculiar circumstances affecting the estates subject to the impost.”

These are the views now held by the officials of the Government, and are doubtless identical with those entertained at head-quarters. They are entirely confirmed by the statistical evidence of the present inquiry. But, if reference be made to the views of the Government in 1853, it will be observed that it was then deemed that a decided necessity for alteration existed. The following were the terms in which the measure was introduced:—

Extract from Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Budget of April, 1853.

“Another change falling more nearly under the head of assessed taxes than any other of the main divisions of my subject, is proposed with the view of giving greater facilities for the redemption of the land-tax. The present provision of the law for the redemption of the land-tax is very stringent, and its operation, in consequence, exceedingly limited. You may redeem a tax of *1*l**. levied on the land by transferring to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt 22*s*. a year in the Funds, but these are extremely unfavourable terms; and instead of requiring 10 per cent. more than the amount of the tax, we propose to reduce it by $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; that is to say, we propose to take $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. less than the amount of stock, which would yield an annual interest equal to the tax redeemed.”

Although the nominal PROPOSED effect of this measure of Mr. Gladstone's,—(which became Law by the Act before adverted to),—was to take $7\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent. less than the amount of Stock yielding an annual interest equal in amount to the Land-Tax Redeemed by the transfer; its REAL actual effect is to take $9\frac{1}{4}$ per Cent. less than the said amount of Stock.

This requires explanation. The following will amply prove the assertion:—For each 100*l*. of Land-Tax to be redeemed, the conditions, under the Acts of Parliament in force between 21st June, 1798, and 15th August, 1853 (38 Geo. III., c. 60, and 42 Geo. III., c. 116), required a Transfer of 110*l*. of Dividend on Three Per Cent. Stock. But, from the 15th August, 1853 (the date of 15 and 16 Vict., c. 74), the wording of the latter Act has not been arranged so as to take, as was proposed, “ $7\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent. less than the amount of Stock which would yield an annual interest equal to the Tax redeemed,” but has been arranged so as to take 17*l*. 10*s*. per Cent. less than the consideration taken by the former Acts. This method of reckoning $17\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent. diminution is, therefore, applicable, in the example before us, to the Sum of 110*l*., instead of to the Sum of 100*l*. And $17\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent. upon 110*l*. is equal to $19\frac{1}{4}$ *l*. upon 100*l*. So that the 110*l*.

Dividend, equivalent under former Acts to 100*l.* Land-Tax, becomes reduced, under the present Act, to 90 $\frac{3}{4}$ *l.* of Dividend for 100*l.* of Land-Tax. The Stock taken is, therefore, less than the value of the Tax by 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ *l.* per Cent.—Q. E. D.

It is by no means unimportant to inquire what loss will be sustained by the Revenue of the country, consequent on the Act 16 & 17 Vict., c. 74.

The aggregate amount of Land-Tax Unredeemed in Great Britain, as on the 15th August, 1853, may be stated with sufficient nearness, and in round numbers, at about 1,150,000*l.* per annum. Under the previously existing Acts, One-Tenth more, or 115,000*l.* per Annum of additional Dividend beyond the Dividend of 1,150,000*l.* on Three Per Cent. Stock, must eventually have been transferred to the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt to carry out the Redemption of this amount of Land-Tax. This would have made 1,265,000*l.* per Annum of perpetual dividend on Stock, the equivalent for the cancelment of 1,150,000*l.* of perpetual revenue from Land-Tax. Then comes the legislation of 1853, which lays down that 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent. less than the Dividend of 1,265,000*l.* shall be taken. This at once reduces the 1,265,000*l.* by the Sum of 221,375*l.*, leaving 1,043,625*l.* in its place (*i. e.*, 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent. less than 1,265,000*l.*, and 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ per Cent. less than 1,150,000*l.*)

*The true meaning and effect of all this was the free gift of a Perpetual Income of 221,375*l.* per annum from the National Revenue to those payers of Land-Tax, from and after 15th August, 1853, who may determine to Redeem or Purchase that Tax.*

The loss in money, to the general community, or taxed public, depends upon the average, or aggregate of averages, of the prices ruling at the past and future periods intervening between the 15th August, 1853, and the date of the entire Redemption of the Land-Tax. For example, if at 95*l.* per Cent. for Three Per Cent. Stock, the gift or loss may be estimated as ultimately worth the Sum of 7,010,000*l.*, say, *Seven Million Pounds Sterling*, or if at 90*l.* per Cent. for Three Per Cent. Stock, it may be calculated at 6,641,000*l.*

This of course supposes, as a condition, that the terms of redemption are not altered in the interim, a supposition which, in one sense, is questionable, seeing that we have the example of disturbance of terms in the very instance of the year 1853, which is the foundation of the preceding remarks; and considering, moreover, that (as was pointed out in the detailed remarks upon our TABLE B) the Commissioners of Inland Revenue perceive that the measure of 1853 was a thorough failure.

(4).—*As to Mr. Mackinnon's Proposal of 1856. — Land-Tax Redemption.*

Notwithstanding the costly concession above described, as having been accorded, in the year 1853, to the payers of Land-Tax, Mr. Mackinnon (the present M.P. for Rye) advocated, in the House of Commons, on the 18th July, 1856,* the consideration of a measure to foster further Redemption of Land-Tax *by the Government accepting Twenty-Four Years' purchase of the Tax.*

* Debate on the Third Reading of the Income and Land-Taxes Bill. Hansard, vol. cxliii.

The Hon. gentleman, at the same time, proposed to include in his plan a revival of the permission to purchase being granted to the general public, as well as to the payers of the tax, (giving the latter the preference for the first Six Months).

There can be little doubt that these easy terms would have led to a rapid, perhaps almost immediate, extinction of the whole tax. *But the cost of it is worth considering.*

At the time of Mr. Mackinnon's proposition, the Funds were at 95½, giving 3*l.* 3*s.* as the rate of Interest, and nearly *Thirty-Two years' purchase*, as the market price of a perpetual annuity or dividend on Three Per Cent. Stock. Such a measure as the redemption proposed—carried out by means of purchases and cancelment of Stock—would soon have brought the price of Consols to Par, as it must have involved purchases, and withdrawal from the market, of *at least Twenty-Four Millions of Stock as the purchase-money of the then Unredeemed Land-Tax, amounting to about 1,140,000*l.* per Annum.*

In this state of things, the Terms under the Act 16 and 17 Vict., c. 74, for immediate Redemption, would have been 17½ Per Cent. less than 36¾ years' purchase, leaving 30¼ years' purchase as the net price of the Tax. $(33\frac{1}{3} \times 1\frac{1}{10}) - 6\frac{5}{12} = 30\frac{1}{4}$.

But Mr. Mackinnon's plan would, as explained, have made 24 years' purchase the net price.

There is, accordingly, a difference of 6¼ years' purchase of the Tax, *making a loss to the taxed public of 7,125,000*l.* (say, in round numbers, Seven Million Pounds Sterling) if the operation had been sanctioned.*

As some may object to the par-price of the Funds being taken as the average ruling price of such a transaction, it is desirable to test the result at another price, viz., at the exact price of the time when it was proposed, or 95½ per Cent., although this admits the improbable supposition of the price of the Funds not advancing. But, even at such a price, the loss would have been between Five and Six Million Pounds Sterling.

And yet the proposition was designated as a measure for reducing the National Debt.

§ 3.—*Select Committee of House of Commons in 1836.—Review of Messrs. Wood and Garnett's Statistics.*

The Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed in February, 1836, to inquire into the state of Agriculture, and into the causes and extent of the distress which pressed upon some important branches of it, did not neglect to collect evidence upon the Land-Tax as one of the burdens assumed to press heavily and inequitably on real property.

The evidence taken by this Committee superseded, for the time, the necessity of a special Committee on the Land-Tax separately, the advisability of which had been urged on more than one previous occasion, as it has since been, down to the Session of the Parliament which has recently been dissolved, and again whilst these remarks were in the press.

The late Mr. John Wood (then Chairman of the Board of Stamps and Taxes), and Mr. Garnett (the then Registrar of Land-Tax),

jointly gave evidence on the Land-Tax; and the Statistics which they delivered to this Committee have been made the basis of most of the statements of members of the Legislature, and others, in subsequent discussions and suggestions on the subject of this impost.

The figures of Messrs. Wood and Garnett have thus been made the foundation of conclusions which have been repeated and quoted in formal documents and motions from 1836 down to the 5th of March, of the present year 1857,* although these figures are anything but deserving of the degree of reputation which it would appear has been conceded to them.

Messrs. Wood and Garnett were asked, by the Committee, to state some of the most striking inequalities existing in the proportions of land-tax raised by different places? It might be supposed that their answer to such a question would have referred to the proportions really raised or collected in the various localities they cited. As has been already shown in TABLE A of the present paper, the nominal and the real assessments are very different. But Messrs. Wood and Garnett proceeded at considerable length to give the Statistics, reckoning upon the amount of Land-Tax on Lands and Tenements according to the assessments of 1798, *without taking any account whatever of the amounts of Tax redeemed in the several localities subsequently to that date.*

It had appeared, indeed, in evidence, that the Law was so interpreted to its letter, requiring that the Land-Tax redeemed should continue to be entered in the assessments, that the poundage or allowance to the Clerks to the Commissioners was continued on the portion of the tax redeemed and extinct, as well as upon that portion which was unredeemed and receivable. The reason of this was alleged by Mr. Wood to be, that the labour in copying the assessments, and executing their other duties connected with the Land-Tax, was not diminished by the redemption.† Mr. Wood also stated that, as regarded Liverpool, he believed the circumstances to be, that the quota unredeemed was 99*l.* and some odd shillings, the rental was the basis of the rating, the sum to be levied in the pound was something less than one-third of a farthing annually, and the consequence was that a rate was made every three years of one farthing, the expense being probably three or four times as much as the sum actually raised, because all the forms of assessing the land-tax, all the duplicates, all the payments into the Exchequer, must go on with as much regularity as if they were 100,000*l.* a-year; and, therefore,

* The date of Mr. Mackinnon's notice of motion for a Select Committee of the last session of the House of Commons on the Land-Tax Redemption.

† Query (1). *Does this poundage of 1½*d.* still exist? If so, and taking the Tax Redeemed at about 770,000*l.* in the year 1857, the 770,000 Sums of Three-Halfpence each, payable upon the extinct portion of the Land-Tax, impose an annual charge upon the country, of about 4,800*l.**

(2). *Is not Clause CLXXVII. of the Act 42 Geo. III., cap. 116, still in force? This Clause provides "that it shall be lawful for the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, or any three or more of them, or the Lord High Treasurer for the time being, whenever they shall think fit, to order and direct that the said allowance of Three Halfpence in the Pound shall cease to be paid for, or in respect of, so much of the said Land-Tax as shall have been redeemed or purchased, anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding."*

the Committee might easily conceive that the expense of levying that upon the inhabitants is three or four times as much as the sum paid into the Exchequer.

The conclusion which we are entitled to draw from these statements of Mr. Wood is, that if the whole tax, at Liverpool, for instance, were redeemed, the entire apparatus and machinery would have to be kept up, and there would be no means of exorcising this ghost of the tax.

All this, however, afforded no adequate justification for the introduction of the nonentity of redeemed tax into the Statistical calculations.

Messrs. Wood and Garnett proceeded to state to the Committee the rate per pound on the Rental, deduced from these merely nominal quotas upon the basis of rental assessed to the House Duty. It is somewhat remarkable that, although in form that rental is quoted as if it were applicable to the year 1836, the year is not stated; and it is open to us to doubt the correctness of this second element of the estimate. For example, the amount of Rental Assessed to the House Duty for London (*i. e.*, the City) is set down at 545,141*l.*, the amount of Land-Tax 87,056*l.*, the corresponding rate per pound on the rental about 3*s.* 2½*d.* But all these figures are considerably wide of the mark. The value of the real property assessment of the City of London was, in all probability, nearly threefold the sum set down, and the Land-Tax payable about Three-Fifths of the stated amount. So that, in round figures, instead of the City Land-Tax being 3*s.* 2½*d.* in the pound, it was somewhere about 8*d.* in the pound.

It would be tedious to prolong the analysis to the thirty other examples; but, as the latter were stated to the Committee, the results were all more or less erroneous than the example just given.

The Committee asked for a statement of the Land-Tax in the rural districts. Mr. Wood replied, "In consequence of the papers relating to the property-tax having been destroyed under an Order of the House of Commons some years ago (that is, all papers having relation to individual property), it is very difficult to make any exact calculation; we want a great number of the statistical details, and it was only last night that we discovered some tables which, I hope, will enable us to present to the Committee a statement of the proportion which the Land-Tax bears to the rental in each county. I have already laid before the Committee a statement of the proportion which the Land-Tax in town bears to rental; and I hope to supply similar statements as to the counties."

The statements here referred to were lodged with the Committee, and form Appendix No. 20, page 544, of their Third Report. This gives the Counties in alphabetical order, the value estimated at Three-Fourths of the amount assessed to the Property-Duty in 1815, the quotas to Land-Tax (*nominal quotas* again), and the corresponding rate per pound of the Tax.*

* In the privately printed work of Mr. Benjamin Sayer, "On the Income Tax as a substitute for other taxes," (London, 1831,) these Assessments under Schedule A of the old Property Act for the last year when it was levied (1814-15) are given in full, and in juxtaposition with the nominal Land-Tax Quotas.

We have re-arranged the results in Divisions or Groups of Counties as before—(see TABLE C, in the next page);—and the careful observer will notice that much of the apparent excessive inequality in the rates in the Pound of the several Counties, arranged alphabetically in the Returns submitted to the Committee, disappears in this Classification into natural groups and divisions.

And, in continuation of the objection already taken to the introduction of the nominal quotas of the Land-Tax, instead of the Real Quotas payable after deduction of the portion redeemed, *we are justified in taking a radical exception to the whole estimate of Messrs. Wood and Garnett*, on the ground of its proceeding upon so mistaken an assumption that about 40 $\frac{1}{4}$ Millions Sterling of annual Value would represent the assessable surface of Real Property in England and Wales at the date of their statement (1836). If they had estimated the amount at 70 Millions Sterling of annual Value, it would have been much nearer the fact.

§ 4.—*Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1846.—Review of Statistics, &c.*

In 1846, a Select Committee of the House of Lords was nominated to inquire into the Burdens affecting Real Property; and, although the answers to their Questions did not elicit so much information as is scattered through the instructive and elaborate statements which fill some of the Thirteen Hundred Folio Pages of the Commons' Select Committees' Minutes of Evidence in 1836, there are, nevertheless, points of importance and interest touched upon.

Mr. Wood again gave evidence on the Land-Tax question. On this occasion he handed in a Statement (printed as Appendix 10) showing the average rate in the pound at which the Land-Tax is charged (as per Return of the Stamps and Taxes Office, 31st March, 1846), taking the value (1) at Three-Fourths of the Amount assessed to the Property-Tax in 1815, *and* (2) *at the amount assessed to the Property-Tax in 1842*, respectively.

These calculations do not seem to have attracted so much attention, or to have been so often quoted, as those before described as given to the House of Commons' Committee. They are, in respect of the first Item, obviously a repetition of the latter,* with, however, the important improvement of which opportunity was afforded by the Returns of Value of Real Property rendered under the provisions of the New Property Tax revived in 1842. But Mr. Wood still clung to the crotchet of calculating his poundages, on the several Counties and places, upon the basis of the nominal quotas, instead of the real quotas of the Land-Tax unredeemed and really payable.

We shall presently see that the Select Committee of the Lords entertained the same lingering affection for the departed, extinguished, fractions of the Tax.

We must return, for the moment, to Mr. Wood's Statistics.

* *i. e.* as to the Rate per Pound on the basis of Three Fourths of the Property Tax Value of 1814-15, before described, and re-arranged in Table C, col. 3, *post*.

Mr. Wood also submitted statements (Appendices 9 and 11 of Minutes of Evidence,) showing the "Striking Inequalities" in several Cities, Towns, and Boroughs separately from the Counties.

These will be found, re-arranged in a parallel Column to the before-mentioned figures, in the subjoined TABLE C, (*Col. 4*).

At this point we may utilize the Statistics and Calculations given in our TABLE A, *ante*, as to the real Quotas of unredeemed Tax. It gives, in fact, and with sufficient nearness, the exact measure of the errors in the conditions, and hence in the results of Mr. Wood's figures, which, if corrected in the manner before explained, that is, reduced to the Ratio of the Unredeemed Land-Tax to the value of Real Property in 1843, are altered to the figures in Col. 5 of the annexed TABLE C.

TABLE C.
RATES PER POUND of the LAND-TAX QUOTAS of ENGLAND AND WALES.

1		2		3		4		5	
Names of		Re-arrangement of the Statistical Results of the late Mr. John Wood, and Mr. William Garnett.		REAL QUOTAS, or Correction, of Mr. Wood's Results stated in the preceding column 4.		RATE PER POUND.			
DIVISIONS.	COUNTIES.	RATE PER POUND of Quotas of Land-Tax, as stated to the Select Com- mittee of the House of Com- mons in 1836 (Messrs. W. & G.)	RATE PER POUND of Quotas of Land-Tax in 1843, as stated to the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1846 (Mr. W.)						
		<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>		<i>s. d.</i>		<i>s. d.</i>	
I.—LONDON AND MID- DLESEX	Middlesex, includ- ing London and Westminster	1 1	0 5			0 3			
II.—SOUTH EASTERN....	Surrey	1 1	0 5½			0 3			
	Kent	1 3¼	0 6			0 3			
	Sussex	1 8	0 8½			0 4½			
	Hampshire	1 1½	0 7½			0 4			
	Berkshire	1 5½	0 9½			0 5			
Total of 5 Counties				0 3½			
III.—SOUTH MIDLAND	Hertfordshire	1 10¾	0 11¾			0 6			
	Buckingham	1 10½	1 1½			0 8			
	Oxfordshire	1 3¼	0 8¾			0 5½			
	Northampton	1 3¾	0 9			0 6½			
	Huntingdon	1 2¾	0 9			0 6½			
	Bedford	2 1	1 1			0 8½			
	Cambridge	1 2½	0 7			0 5			
Total of 7 Counties				0 6			
IV.—EASTERN	Essex	1 5¾	0 11			0 5¼			
	Suffolk	1 8	0 10			0 7			
	Norfolk	1 5½	0 8½			0 6½			
	Total of 3 Counties			0 6			

TABLE C.—Continued.

RATES PER POUND *of the LAND-TAX QUOTAS of ENGLAND AND WALES.*

1		2	3	4	5
Names of		Re-arrangement of the Statistical Results of the late Mr. John Wood, and Mr. William Garnett.		REAL QUOTAS, or Correction, of Mr. Wood's Results stated in the preceding column 4.	
DIVISIONS.	COUNTIES.	RATE PER POUND of Quotas of Land-Tax as stated to the Select Com- mittee of the House of Com- mons in 1836. (Messrs.W.&G.)	RATE PER POUND of Quotas of Land-Tax in 1843, as stated to the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1846. (Mr. W.)	RATE PER POUND.	
V.—SOUTH-WESTERN..	Wiltshire	<i>s. d.</i> 1 1½	<i>s. d.</i> 0 8½	o	5½
	Dorsetshire	1 2	0 8½	o	5½
	Devonshire	1 0¾	0 7½	o	4½
	Cornwall	0 10½	0 5½	o	3½
	Somerset	0 9¾	0 5½	o	3½
	Total of 5 Counties	o	4½
VI.—WEST MIDLAND....	Gloucester	0 11½	0 5½	o	3
	Hereford	0 10½	0 5¾	o	3¾
	Salop	0 8½	0 4½	o	3½
	Stafford	0 6¾	0 2½	o	1¾
	Worcester	1 0¾	0 5¾	o	3½
	Warwick	0 9¾	0 3¾	o	2½
VII.—NORTH MIDLAND	Total of 6 Counties	o	2¾
	Leicester	0 11½	0 6	o	3¾
	Rutland	1 0½	0 8½	o	5
	Lincoln	0 10¾	0 5¾	o	4½
	Nottingham.....	0 11½	0 5½	o	3¾
	Derby	0 8½	0 4	o	2¾
VIII.—NORTH-WESTN.	Total of 5 Counties	o	3¾
	Chester	0 7¾	0 3½	o	2½
	Lancaster	0 2	0 0½	o	0½
	Total of 2 Counties	o	0¾
	York, including North, East, and West Ridings	0 2¾	o	1½
	IX.—YORK				

TABLE C.—Continued.
 RATES PER POUND of the LAND-TAX QUOTAS of ENGLAND AND WALES.

1		2		3		4		5
Names of		Re-arrangement of the Statistical Results of the late Mr. John Wood, and Mr. William Garnett.		REAL QUOTAS, or Correction, of Mr. Wood's Results stated in the preceding column 4.		RATE PER POUND.		
DIVISIONS.	COUNTIES.	RATE PER POUND of Quotas of Land-Tax as stated to the Select Com- mittee of the House of Com- mons in 1836. (Messrs.W. & G.)	RATE PER POUND of Quotas of Land-Tax in 1843, as stated to the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1846. (Mr. W.)					
X.—NORTHERN	Durham	s. d. 0 3½	s. d. 0 1½	s. d. 0 0¾				
	Northumberland...	0 3½	0 2½	0 1½				
	Cumberland	0 1½	0 1	0 0¾				
	Westmoreland.....	0 3½	0 2	0 0¾				
	Total of 4 Counties	0 0¾				
XI.—WELSH.....	Monmouth	0 9¾	0 3¾	0 2¾				
	South Wales.							
	Glamorgan	0 6½	0 3	0 2½				
	Carmarthen	0 4¾	0 2½	0 2				
	Pembroke	0 4½	0 1¾	0 1				
	Cardigan	0 2¾	0 1½	0 1				
	Brecon	0 5¾	0 3½	0 2½				
	Radnor	0 8½	0 4¾	0 3½				
	North Wales.							
	Montgomery	0 8¾	0 4	0 3½				
	Flint	0 4	0 1¾	0 1½				
	Denbigh	0 7	0 4½	0 3½				
	Merioneth	0 7	0 3¾	0 3				
	Carnarvon	0 5½	0 2	0 1½				
	Anglesey	0 5½	0 2½	0 1½				
	Total of 13 Counties	0 2½				
ENGLAND AND WALES	Total of 52 Counties*	0 3				
England, Wales, and Scotland	Total	0 10	0 4¾				
Scotland	Total	0 2½	0 1¼				

* The amounts for Middlesex including London and Westminster, for the three Ridings of York together, and for England and Wales alone, do not appear specifically in Messrs. Wood and Garnett's figures, but they are supplied in the above Table in consonance with their data. The other items in cols. 3 and 4 are extracted as stated.

The Select Committee of the House of Lords reported that, in their opinion, the Land-Tax is a burden upon Land, inasmuch as it must be deducted from the gross proceeds of the Land before its net Product can become available as Profits of Capital.

Some of the witnesses examined by the Committee had arrived, however, at a very different conclusion, based upon considerations of a constitutional and economical character. For instance, Mr. Robert Hyde Greg, a former M.P. for Manchester, a large landowner and farmer, as well as manufacturer, submitted that the Land-Tax is not a burden upon Land, because the State had become a permanent joint Proprietor of the Land with the Landlord, and that when the Land-Tax becomes a permanent Tax, the State becomes a permanent proprietor jointly with the owner of every Estate, and that Estate, so curtailed, is handed down and inherited.

Mr. Nassau Senior expressed views to the same effect; and he distinguished between the incidence of a new Tax and that of a fixed permanent Tax. (*Vide* his answers to Questions 5,479 to 5,510).

Notwithstanding all this, and the further circumstance that even *if the Land-Tax were an unjust Tax*, the co-existence of the Property and Income-Tax would go very far to annihilate that supposed injustice of it, it is quite manifest that, as all Landed Estates and Tenements are held by the present lives in possession as inheritances or purchases of Rents, *minus the unredeemed Land-Tax*, there is not the shadow of just ground for complaint.*

The Committee proceeded to report that, "Although the Quotas are fixed in reference to each district by the Act of George the Third, the Law admits a variation in the allotment of the Sum amongst the different owners of Property within the District, and Redemptions continue in consequence, although, except for the purpose of Insurance against an increased Rate on improved property, the privilege of redemption is, at the present price of the Funds, nearly a dead letter."

The Committee then state, "This Tax is most unequal in its pressure; and, from the Statements put in by Mr. Wood, it appears that the Quotas are higher in proportion to the Value of Property in the purely agricultural Counties than in the mining and manufacturing Districts."

* Comparison of the statement in 1831 of Mr. Benjamin Sayer (formerly Under Secretary of the Property Tax) in his privately printed work, before referred to, may not be out of place. That gentlemen observed "that the Land Tax does not operate as a burthen on the owners of Estates in cases where the Estates have been purchased long since the commencement of it; being a certain known charge on the owner, the purchase-money for the Property charged has been proportionably less; when let, the tenant pays the Tax to the Revenue, and so much less Rent to the owner."

This is the *rationale* why a *fixed* Land Tax does not influence prices of the products of the Land. The House of Lords' Committee seem to have questioned Mr. Senior on this head without a clear definition on their part of the conditions of the Problem they require to be solved. Questions of Freedom of Corn Trade; existence, or the contrary, of extensive indirect Taxation, or of a subtle, searching, system of direct Taxation, all modify the appropriate answer. We shall presently, (in the Second Part of this paper,) have occasion to refer to Sir William Petty's views at a much earlier period. He held that prices of produce under the then circumstances and on the imposition of a new Land-Tax would be affected by the Tax.

These observations are open to a considerable qualification. It is quite obvious that, in some of the Counties, particularly those of central and northern England, in the great hives of manufacturing industry and commerce, the value of real property, since the time of the Assessment of 4 William and Mary, would augment in a higher ratio than elsewhere; but, allowing for the redemption, the purely agricultural counties are by no means subject to the alleged unequality of *pressure*, the power of increase of Rent of Land being of necessity unequal to the power of increase of Rent of Tenements in a growing and prosperous community. The annexed TABLE D is in illustration of this point.

It has already been stated, that the Commissioners of Inland Revenue—writing in 1857—take a very opposite view to that of the Committee of the Lords in 1846; and that the former, far from admitting pressure, deem the burden of the Tax to be generally quite trivial.

The Land-Tax, as a reserved rent, is the amount—neither subject to increase nor decrease—belonging permanently to the State. But let us, for the moment, suppose the contrary to be the fact, and admit the tax to be a burden which presses upon Land. What, then, will be the circumstances of the alleged unequal pressure on the *agricultural* counties? The question will be one of proportionality to the means of bearing the tax.—Hence the usefulness of a Table like that in the opposite page.—Considering its results in connexion with the preceding observations, the teaching of it is, that the admission of pressure would be based upon an argument which, when tested upon the figures of the means of bearing the tax, leads to the false conclusion, that the Landlords would be justified if they were to complain of the annual Value of Lands having in thirty-four years (1814-48), increased only about 23 Per Cent.,—whilst the annual value of Messuages, including houses, shops, and warehouses, had, unequally, increased in the same period about 161 per Cent., and whilst the annual value of other Items of Real Property, including mines, canals, and railways, had, also unequally, increased about 213 Per Cent.

Reduced to the closest abstract statement, what has been just adverted to would be nothing else than admitting the reasonableness of a complaint, that the laws of nature and of economical science do not allow of the annual rent which represents the produce of the land, quite keeping pace in its ratio of home-growth (in countries similarly circumstanced to ours, and in the period referred to) comparatively with the simultaneous growth of other property which the increase and the wants of the people have called into existence.

Columns 3 and 4 of the TABLE D show that, whilst the income from Lands in England and Wales constituted upwards of 64 per Cent. of the whole income from Real Property in 1814-15, it had fallen to 45 per Cent. of the whole in 1848. Owing to the form in which the Returns are published, a calculation cannot be made for England and Wales separately as regards the last year 1855-6. But the figures for the United Kingdom in that year (*vide* Column 8) show that the proportion of Rents of Land has now fallen to 41 per Cent. of the annual value of Real Property.

TABLE D.

ANNUAL VALUE of various descriptions of REAL PROPERTY in ENGLAND and WALES in 1814 compared with 1848. Calculation of PER-CENTAGES of each description at the two periods, and of the AGGREGATE INCREASE, in the Thirty-four Years, 1814-48.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
SCHEDULE A. of Property-Tax.	ENGLD. AND WALES. Year 1814-15.		ENGLD. AND WALES. Year 1848-9.		1814 to 1848, 34 Years.	Supplementary Columns. UNITED KINGDOM, Year 1855-6.	
Description of Real Property Assessed.	Annual Value of each description.	Ratio borne by each de- scription to the Total Annual Value.	Annual Value of each description.	Ratio borne by each de- scription to the Total Annual Value.	Comparative Results of Increase.	Annual Value of each description.	Ratio borne by each de- scription to the Total Annual Value.
	Millions £	Per Cent.	Millions £	Per Cent.	Per Cent. upon Amounts in 1814.	GREAT BRITAIN. Millions £	Per Cent.
1. LANDS	34,330	64·2	42,348	44·8	23·3	46,921	41·0
2. MESSUAGES, includ- ing Houses, Shops, and Warehouses ...	14,895	27·8	38,822	41·1	160·6	48,435	42·4
SUNDRIES, viz.—							
3. Tithes	2,733	8·0	0,506	14·1	213·1	0,367	16·6
4. Manors	0,072		0,164			0,187	
5. Fines	0,2·7		0,284			0,307	
6. Quarries	0,049		0,290			0,320	
7. Mines	0,616		2,174			2,986	
8. Iron Works.....	No Retn.		0,738			1,427	
9. Fisheries.....	"		0,015			0,062	
10. Canals	"		1,107			0,862	
11. Railways.....	"		5,790			9,529	
12. Gas Works	"		0,649			0,709	
13. Other Property	0,575		1,523			2,014	
14. General Profits	0,018		0,123			0,190	
Total 3 to 14	4,270		13,368			19,010	
TOTAL ASSESSMENT (Items 1 to 14)	£53,495,375	100·0	£94,538,472	100·0	76·7	(1.) GREAT BRITAIN. £114,366,956	100·0
						(2.) IRELAND. £11,878,545	
						(3.) UNITED KINGDOM. £126,245,501	
SCHEDULE B. Profits arising from the occupancy of Lands, &c., directly assessed in Schedule A	£36,260,565	...	£42,529,923	...	17·3	UNITED KINGDOM. £49,517,546	...

Note, as to TABLE D.—In *Cols.* 2, 4, and 7, the three figures at the unit end are omitted for the sake of space and clearness. Thus, 34,330 represents about 34,300,000*l.*; and 0,072 represents 72,000*l.*

The Select Committee of the Lords concluded their Remarks on the Land-Tax with a very remarkable statement, viz. :—

“The amount of Land-Tax which has been redeemed no longer appears as a Burden upon the Land; but it must not be forgotten that the proprietors of Land, in order to escape from the operation of the Tax, have paid over to the State an amount of Capital of which the Sum Redeemed represents the Annual Interest, and of which the State is still deriving the advantage.”

This statement is fraught with fallacies. How could the State be still deriving the advantage of Interest from the Capital paid for previous redemptions of Land-Tax? It only exchanged its right to receive a certain proportion of Rent, payable to it as a first charge in perpetuity, against its own engagement to pay a certain equivalent interest on debts which it had contracted and secured upon Funded Stock, also in perpetuity.—This was the position of the State in the transaction; now what was that of the proprietor of Land who redeemed the so-called Land-Tax? He only exchanged a given amount of realized Capital, to receive in perpetuity a certain proportion of rent theretofore belonging to the State. This had the same effect as if the Proprietor had laid out the like amount of capital in such improvements as permanently improved his income, from the land, to the extent of the annual Tax he purchased or redeemed.

An example in figures will best illustrate the practical working of this. A Landed Proprietor, A, had, say in the year 1800, an estate on which the Land-Tax was 100*l.* per Annum. Being an improving landlord, and the measure for redemption being for many reasons popular at the time, he proceeded to avail himself of it at the then high rate of Interest, 5 Per Cent., and consequent low price of 60*l.* for each 100*l.* Consols. Under the terms of the Act, he had to transfer to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt either 3,666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* Consols, or 3 Per Cent. Reduced Annuities, or 2,200*l.* money. We will suppose that he paid this amount of money. The State then, on the one hand, surrendered to him their first charge of 100*l.* per Annum on his estate, extricated him from the liability to a higher assessment in his District, and, on the other hand, cancelled 110*l.* per Annum of Gross Interest subject to Income Tax, which it had previously been paying to the Stockholder.

But this was no advantage to the State. The transaction was one of transfer. The State neither had the advantage of the 2,200*l.* money, nor could it spend it except by defeating the supposed, although unreal, Sinking Fund operations, and creating fresh Debt equivalent to the amount. All that was accomplished consisted in the taking of A's 2,200*l.* money into the Stock Market by the Government Broker, and the transfer of it to B or C, or some other capitalist, in exchange for Stock at the market price of the day, and often at a losing price to the State.

And, nevertheless, the real meaning of the Committee's words, if applied to this example, would be, that the State derived advantage

of Interest, say of 100*l.* per annum, from the year 1800 to the date of their Report (1846),—and, that the Landlord was mulcted in that Interest, and should be credited with it, besides the 4*l.* 10*s.* 11*d.* Per Cent. of Interest which he derived from his investment in Land-Tax, *i. e.*, 100*l.* per annum purchased for 2,200*l.*

The Lords' Committee, the officials of the Stamps and Taxes, and members of the House of Commons who have introduced motions to consider the advisability of an equalization of the Land-Tax, have not only insisted upon the startling inequalities it gives rise to between County and County, an impression which it has been proved is by no means borne out in the same degree when the Counties are arranged in Groups or Divisions instead of alphabetically as heretofore; but they have also pointed emphatically to the striking differences between this and that town, and between the one or other parish.

Examination will show that the same method of induction from the fallacy of nominal quotas has prevailed in these subdivided Statistics. It would be wearisome to quote examples, and they may be seen in abundance in the evidence before the two Committees so frequently adverted to, and subsequently in an important Land-Tax Return to an Address of the House of Commons, dated July, 1849.

It cannot be successfully contended that, even (which is very doubtful) if any grounds could be maintained for showing the advisability of equalizing certain other Taxes, the differences in which, as pressing upon particular localities, are often urged upon public attention, the same conclusions ought to have equal weight or analogy in the case of a Land-Tax.

Defining from a modern point of view, the British "Land-Tax," is not, in the same sense as other Imposts, an assessed charge, but is simply a synonym for a certain amount of Reserved Rent on Lands and Tenements, to which amount the nation is entitled in Fee Simple.

It does not require the test of statistics to show that, except in the imaginary visions of socialism, inequalities of comparative progress or regress are the normal state of human societies. Yet it does demand a very peculiar way of viewing such topics to contend that, because a larger proportionate amount is the property of the State under the Conditions of the Land-Tax (as is likewise the case with the Land Revenues of the Crown) in District B than in District A, it follows that Districts A and B,—and so on through the alphabet of districts—should be brought to the same level.

In answering a proposition of this kind, the respondent has nothing to concede to such considerations as that the District A has had the good fortune or industry to improve its Rental, and the District B the ill-luck or improvidence to diminish its Rental; and that these are reasonable claims for shifting a larger burden on District A, and a lesser one on District B, in order to bring about an equalization.

But there are ample reasons in opposition to such a step. *First*, the rule that the right of the Crown or nation precedes all other rights; and that if District A, or any other, produced no more Rent than would suffice to pay the Land-Tax, there would still exist no inequity.

Secondly, in the settlement of the Land-Tax, this country wisely refrained from a principle, not unknown in foreign countries, of attempting such a survey (or *cadastre*) as would fix a certain charge on each field and parcel of ground according to the more or less sanguine or narrow views entertained as to its productive capability. The settlement of the British Land-Tax proceeded on a different basis. It imposed a certain rate of contribution on Districts, and on a few important towns, and left the charge of collecting that rate to local self-government, in preference to committing it to the clumsy unconstitutionality of centralization.

It will be seen in the second and concluding portion of the present paper, that, upon examining the political arithmetic of the Seventeenth Century in its relation to the Land-Tax question, the rates levied upon Districts between the years 1643 and 1698, that is, during the times of Charles I., the Commonwealth, and the Restoration, can statistically be shown, contrary to the usual opinion, to have been apportioned with considerable regard to the respective proportionate values of Real Property in the several Counties. That even when compared with the ratios of capability to bear the Assessment of the same Counties at the present day, it will be found that the Real Property Assessments of 1643-1857, *i. e.*, of upwards of Two Centuries, have been by no means radically unjust, and that what has been said to the contrary had no foundation in proper statistical inquiry.

Thirdly, whilst the claims on the Districts have not been comparatively with each other, unfair, the Claims on Portions of the Districts have uniformly been subject to redistribution between the several portions as occasion might require. This will be quite evident to those who will take the trouble of perusing the Land-Tax Acts, whether they be those passed in the reigns of Charles I., of the time of the Commonwealth, by the governments of the Restoration and Revolution, or of George III. If a later proof be required, it is but two months ago (*viz.*, in March, 1857) that the Middlesex Land-Tax Commission met to settle the Land-Tax Quotas of the County, according to annual custom, which admits of redistribution amongst the contributories in each part of a given district, according to the changed actual annual value of the Real Property respectively held by them.

Fourthly, from the year 1798, *it has* always been within the power of the contributories to the Land-Tax to cease to be so under the conditions of redemption, and so to remove the property out of which their Rents arise entirely beyond the incidence of the Land-Tax. This protects, not only the original Rent, but the improved Rent. It is, of course, true that the improved Rent comes under the operation of the Property and Income Tax, but that is the condition of productive property in general, and not a special hardship on the Landowner.

PART II.—LAND-TAX STATISTICS, 1636 TO 1798.

§ 5.—*Review of the Political Arithmetic on Land-Tax questions during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, with special regard to the opinions of Sir John Sinclair, Sir Robert Walpole, Lord Halifax, Dr. Davenant, and John Houghton, &c., with NEW CALCULATIONS and STATISTICS.*

No inquiry into the Statistics of Land-Tax can be complete, or even understood, without some research into the Political Arithmetic of the period when its assessment was first settled.

The present attempt to give as general a view as the limits of this article, and the available means of illustrating it by figures, will admit of, is not put forward as comprising more than a series of notes and calculations, which it is hoped may be serviceable to those members of the Statistical Society who are desirous of thoroughly investigating the subject.

Without professing to preserve the strict order of a formal treatise, it will be absolutely essential to refer to what was said, as the reason for what was done, in Land-Tax legislation, during the periods prior to the time of its present settlement. And it will be by no means uninteresting to consider, whether what then took place had its origin in the face of evidence of alleged statistical proof of inequity of assessment, or if the contrary was really the fact.

For this purpose, the matter must be traced back from 1798; and particular attention must be directed to the oft-repeated assertion, in Parliament, of grave injustice, and of wrongful dealing, as attaching to the original apportionment of the various quotas of the several counties. Such statements were repeated from one generation of statesmen to another; and it is obvious Mr. Pitt had to endure much of the inherited odium belonging to this supposed fault in the assessment. That minister, however, successfully carried through Parliament his Land-Tax Redemption Bill; and, in introducing it, he used language distinguished alike by modesty of expression and by honest conviction of the soundness of his measure. His words were—

“That he claimed a great deal of merit to the measure, but none “from the proposal. The principle itself possessed that recommendation which usually belonged to good principles; that it was “so simple that the advantages to be produced by its effects did not “necessarily suppose a great share of merit in the proposer.”

Separately from considerations of party, it is difficult to understand upon what foundation the statements in opposition could have been maintained, if they were to show that the proposal was a tempting of the Landowner, and, in a lesser degree, of the public, to improvidence.

The plan, reduced to its practical operation, was but a permissive measure for exchanging an obligation of the Nation to pay the fundholder a perpetual annuity, or dividend, upon government Stock, against a corresponding obligation to the Nation, to pay it a perpetual

*Annuity, called a Land-Tax, charged on the Rent of Lands and Tenements.**

The late Sir John Sinclair was one of the chief opponents of Mr. Pitt's measure. His criticisms upon it are repeated in his *History of the Public Revenue* in which is inserted, at full length, his very long speech in opposition, delivered in the Debate of 9th May, 1798, on the Land-Tax Redemption Bill.

On that occasion, he took up the old stock of objections with which a perusal of the works of those writers of the Seventeenth Century who were adverse to the Land-Tax might have impressed him.

It is observable that Sir John Sinclair rested especially on the conclusions of Sir Robert Walpole, some sixty-six years previously, when that Statesman so vigorously condemned the Land-Tax on the occasion of the Debate in the House of Commons, upon his motion, of 9th February, 1732, for reviving the Salt Duty.

Sir John Sinclair quoted to the House extracts from Sir Robert Walpole's speech, taken from Torbuck's Debates (vol. x). The words there reported are nearly identical with those in the Parliamentary History subsequently published (vol. viii., 1811). They are as follows:—

EXTRACT I.†—"As to the manner of raising Taxes upon the people, it is a certain maxim that that tax, which is the most equal and the most general, is the most just and the least burdensome. When every man contributes a small share, a great sum may be raised for the public service without any man being sensible what he pays; whereas a small sum, raised upon a few, lies heavy upon each particular man, and is the more grievous in that it is unjust."

EXTRACT II.—"*There is no Tax that ever was laid upon the people of this nation that is more unjust and unequal than the Land-Tax. The Landholders bear but a small proportion to the people of this nation, or of any nation; yet no man contributes any the least share to this Tax but he that is possessed of a landed estate; and yet this Tax has been continued without intermission for above these Forty Years. It has continued so long, and lain so heavy, that I may venture to say many a landed gentleman has thereby been ruined and undone.*"

EXTRACT III.—"*The Land-Tax is the most unequal, the most grievous, and the most oppressive Tax that ever was raised in this country. It is a Tax which never ought to be raised but in times of the most extreme necessity. The best judges, the truest patriots in all countries, have been of opinion that, of all Taxes, that upon immovable goods, that upon Lands and Houses, ought to be the last resource.*"

Sir John Sinclair reminded the House that this language of a former Chancellor of the Exchequer was received with repeated

* The late Mr. Marshall's "Statistical Display of the United Kingdom," page 24, may be consulted for the figures of the Gross Receipts of Land-Tax for each of the thirty-two years 1797-1828, the amount of Three Per Cent. Stock cancelled, Expenses incurred, &c. These Items were extracted from the annual Finance Accounts, and other parliamentary returns, and their accuracy was confirmed by Messrs. Wood and Garnett to the Committee of 1836 on Agricultural distress.

Mr. Marshall's opinion was, that Mr. Pitt's measure for the redemption of the Land-Tax justly deserved to be regarded as the most interesting ever submitted to the legislative consideration. Without concurring in so extreme a view as this, we may fairly term it a very important measure.

† These extracts were not numbered by Sir J. Sinclair; but it is right to do so, as the passages were not continuous portions of Sir R. Walpole's Speech.

"*hearems*" and "*tumults of applause*." He did not, however, state that the orator was feeling his way as to how far the House would go in the direction of exclusive indirect Taxation. Neither did he quote the important explanatory words with which Walpole concluded the paragraph we have just repeated. It will be desirable to supply this deficiency in the annexed Extract IV:—

EXTRACT IV.—"In such a case (*i. e.*, that of direct taxation) there are but few of the people that contribute to the public expense, and even among those few there will always be a great partiality as to the value that is put upon men's estates. This we are very sensible of in England. There are some landed gentlemen that pay a Land-Tax equal to the full value of their Estates, while others do not pay equal to a third part of the real value; and generally those gentlemen who suffer most by this partiality are those whose ancestors were a sort of knight-errants for the Revolution. They gloried in that happy event; they thought themselves in honour and justice obliged to pay their equal share for the support of so glorious a cause in proportion to the real value of the Estates they possessed; and, therefore, they gave them in at their full value. This was justice—this was laudable zeal for the happiness of the nation, and for the liberties and privileges of the people; but their posterity suffered severely for it; and, as they always will be the greatest sufferers by every Land-Tax, ought not the merit and the honest zeal of their forefathers to plead strongly for their relief, at least with all those who are friends to our present happy establishment?"

Sir Robert Walpole knew how to apply Statistics, or the Arithmetic of Politics, with profound skill when he thought either the occasion or his argument required it; but, in the instance referred to, this does not appear to have been his course, nor did he adduce any details or facts which could readily connect the incidence of the Land-Tax with the desperate state to which the Landed interests, and especially that section of them which had promoted the Revolutionary Establishment, were described as having sunk.

It should be observed that Sir R. Walpole was addressing a body consisting chiefly of landholders, and upon a proposition (which was carried through the two Houses) for reviving a Tax on a prime necessary of life, instead of levying an extra shilling to make up Two Shillings in the pound upon Land. This extra shilling depended upon the fate of the proposed Salt-Tax. It was useful to Walpole to impress the general public, as well as the Parliament, with the notion that the landed gentry stood in need of commiseration; so that his great effort of statesmanship, the Excise Bill, which he was on the eve of introducing, might have more reasonable chances of success. The appeal as to the loyal sacrifices of the leading promoters of the Revolution was a pretty sure political card. But, in referring to their pecuniary losses, he omitted to mention that many of them, perhaps the majority, were reimbursed by alienations from the Crown of its Land Revenues, and that the constitutional sovereigns, William and Mary, had not acted towards their chief adherents very differently from the first William or the eighth Henry.

In many parts of his speech, Walpole drew a very lugubrious picture of the encumbered landlord bending under the weight of Mortgages, Annuities, Jointures, &c. He described the Land-Tax as if it were the last straw which was to break the burdened camel's back.—But let us stop to inquire whether any facts or figures can statistically be brought to show that he was well founded in these

grave assertions of the gross injustice and hardship that had been inflicted upon the landed gentry by the Land-Tax.

It may be assumed, as a fact, that many of the landlords were, as the Minister described them, deeply embarrassed with Annuities, Mortgages, and the like effects of expenditure and of debt. But we may also assume it, as susceptible of historical proof, that the wild speculation in bubble projects, the reckless living, and the improvident habits, of a class which had deplorably fallen back from the high qualities of the English gentlemen of the first half of the Seventeenth Century, were all circumstances which told their tale upon the fortunes of Sir R. Walpole's landed friends.

Unless, however, we could prove that but little significance attaches to the lessons given by constitutional and financial history, we should be unable to advance, with any likelihood of conviction, that the Landholders of Great Britain ever were, in any systematic manner, unjustly taxed. And if we compare their quotas of contribution, and their relative means of meeting them, with those of other classes of the community, we cannot fail to remark that, at the outset of the British system of society, the pecuniary means of those other classes, and every nerve and sinew of thought and labour, were strained to keep the rural aristocracy in that place of rank and of power which it held exclusively.

Whether this or that war was a right object to justify a Land-Tax, and whether any particular expense or extravagance ought to have been nationally incurred, are wholly different, and purely ethical, questions, which do not belong to financial and statistical inquiries, although often erroneously mixed up with them, and particularly in reviews of our Funded System.

The British Land-Tax Assessments were nothing more than the substitute, in an equitable and judicious form, for the Saxon and Norman Hydage, Aids, Scutages, Knightages, Tallages, and other statutable excises from real and personal property and income, which were charged as the homage and service due to the head of the State, and to the constitutional management of its home and foreign polity. Instead of the earlier and ruder burdens of personal attendance and service, and of contributions in kind, which the burgess had to render in respect of his burgage—(as the land as well as the tenement was termed),—or which the feudal Lord owed to the Crown as regarded his tenure, these assessments fixed the lighter burden of settled pecuniary quotas, adapted rateably to the real and personal estates of that part of the people who possessed the means of contributing to the public charge; and, as the object of these assessments was in chief measure for the defence of the realm and of the property of the landed gentry, and of the Crown, including its administrative policy within and beyond it, it would, therefore, have been reasonable at such times even if the whole burden had been assessed upon Land.

The surveys, Domesday and Census Books, of the Saxon and Norman sovereigns, were intended, amongst other well-considered ends, to secure the laying down of a *cadastre* by which to levy such assessments according to an equitable valuation. It certainly was not the Landowners, but rather the denizens of cities, who were penned within walls for easier fleecing as well as for mutual safe-

guard, that needed protection. The early municipal charters, and especially those of the metropolitan city, fully prove this.

We should, moreover, guard ourselves against drawing a general inference of injustice of assessment, from some exceptional cases of opposition that arose, more easily than elsewhere, in the border Northern Counties which had their own additional and peculiar burdens to bear in providing men and arms for defence against the raids and forays of their Trans-Tweedian neighbours, and in the Western Counties against those of the Welsh. In this state of things, the Northern and Western Counties were sometimes apt to be obstructive when called upon to contribute towards certain national objects. For instance, the Parliament, in 1489, had sanctioned a subsidy, by way of a Land-Tax throughout England, to pay the expenses of an army sent into Brittany. The money was paid by all the Counties except Yorkshire and the Bishoprick of Durham. It is important to observe, that the latter Counties did not object to the *ratio* of assessment, but only to the *cause of its requirement*.*

Henry the Seventh's reign did not pass over without the Western counties taking up the ill example of the Northern. Thus, the Cornish rebellion arose from the same kind of objection. The inhabitants of the West thought that the expense of repelling the rapacious incursions of the Scotch ought to have devolved entirely upon the Northern counties, and not been levied as a Land-Tax upon all the counties.†

Here is very considerable foundation to warrant the idea that the epithets, or rather *misnomers*, of Land-Tax and Land Subsidies,—which were really only Property and Income Taxes, and ought to have been called by some such names,—frequently led to that deeply imbued impression, which has rankled in the breasts of the Landholders, that the burden on land and other real property was excessive.

But it must be observed: *First*, that the property derived otherwise than from the soil, and from immoveable property, in countries which, like England, until about the middle of the Six-

* See Lord Bacon's "History of Henry the Seventh," in which he remarks upon this event, "The two last openly and obstinately refused to pay it, not out of necessity, but by reason of the old humour of these counties, where the memory of King Richard was so strong that it laid like lees in the bottom of men's hearts, and if the vessels were once stirred it would rise."

The history of the insurrection may be briefly condensed:—The Commissioners for assessing the Tax applied to the Earl of Northumberland, who soon after lost his life in the insurrection. The Court was informed through him. The Earl of Surrey was forthwith sent, with a suitable force, against the rebels. Many were made prisoners, including John à Chambre, the ringleader, who was executed at York, with the distinction of a very lofty gibbet. The King went to York after the victory, and then returned to London, leaving the Earl of Surrey as his lieutenant, and Sir Richard Tunstall as Chief Commissioner to levy the Subsidy, of which, it is stated, not one denier was excused.

† The decisive victory at Blackheath, in 1497, put a stop to this formidable and sanguinary rebellion. See Bacon's "History of Henry VII.," Hume, &c. This was but one of the many revolts with which the annals of early British Taxation are filled. The Ship-Money Controversy, a century and a half later, gave but the climax to the traditions on these subjects, which had been inherited from the times of the Tudor sovereigns. (See the declaration of Parliament upon the Commission of Array, Statute 5 Henry IV., &c.)

teenth Century, and like France until a century later, had no commercial pre-eminence, was but inconsiderable. *Secondly*, that a system of Excise, on articles of consumption, would then have been impracticable. *Thirdly*, that Customs Revenues could only be farmed for the most trivial amount. *Fourthly*, that the great chief burden alleged to press upon the Land, viz., the *Poor's Rates*, had, until the suppression of the Religious Houses, no existence.

The questions of assumed injustice arising out of the so-called special burdens on land are amongst the most remarkable of those battles of words which have occupied so much of the time and attention of Parliament for several generations back.* This particular logomachy, as to the crushing weight of a Land-Tax at so much in the pound, is but a type of the never-ending complaints of a section of the community against the Property and Income Tax, and whose opinions are so constituted that they would complain of the sevenpenny, or any other, assessment of pence per pound, whilst they would consent to pay a larger tax provided they could deceive themselves by not seeing the exact ratio of poundage expressed in the hard and precise language of direct Taxation.

A writer of the Seventeenth century (whose common sense shines through his homely language) has some very truthful remarks upon this head. He observes:—

“ ’Twill hardly gain belief, that there is many of the meaner People, *Labourers*, and *Mechanicks* that, by their expense, when they are (as too many be) extravagant, pay to the publick *Taxes* above one-tenth of their daily profit. As, supposing that a labouring man may earn *Sixteen Pounds a-year*, he will expend, though not very extraordinarily profuse, one-half of it in *Drink* and *Tabaco*, upon which the duty of Customs and Excise is, at least, two pounds of the eight, which he lays out in idle Expenses. Now, it would be vehemently decried and exclaimed against, as the greatest oppression upon the Poor imaginable, if, by a *Poll* or *Land-Tax*, this man, that virtually pays *Forty Shillings*, should actually, and above board, pay so many pence by the year.”†

The experience of nearly 170 years since the preceding passage was written has served to show that its truth cannot be controverted.

* *Ce n'est pas seulement parmi les Sçavants que les Logomachies sont pernicieuses, elles le sont encore dans tous les états. elles troublent les sociétés, mettent les armes à la main, rendent les nations ennemies, brouillent et ruinent les familles, entretiennent les discordes; elles sont un piège que les ambitieux, et ceux qui ne peuvent vivre que dans le trouble, tiennent toujours prêt pour entraîner les peuples dans les séditions, et les révoltes. J'ai été souvent étonné de voir combien on est peu en garde contre un mal qui se renouvelle tous les jours, qui tous les jours dans le général, comme dans le particulier nous fait sentir ses funestes effets. (Vide the rare work attributed to Gros de Boze, entitled “Le Livre jaune, ou Conversations sur les Logomachies.”—Bâle, 1748.)*

† See the pamphlet licensed, Nov. 11th, 1689, and printed in the year 1690, entitled “*Taxes no Charge*, in a letter from a gentleman to a person of quality, showing the nature, use, and benefit of Taxes in this Kingdom, and compared with the impositions of Foreign States, &c.” The writer is of the school so competently represented by De Pinto of Amsterdam, whose Essay was published at Paris in 1761, and in English in 1774. In “*Taxes no Charge*,” we see a just appreciation of the control of Parliament in this country compared with the shadow of constitutional and popular power exercised in the continental nations, and which fairly justified the touching complaint that the French historian, *De Mezeray*, made to our *John Hampden*. Vide the latter's Pamphlet, “*Some Considerations about the most proper Way of raising Money in the present Conjuncture*,” 1692.

Taxation is, and always has been, a pill difficult of deglutition. The wisest and greatest statesmen—the most popular and august assemblages—have spent time immeasurable in devising means how best to gild that pill and to make it passable, if not palatable.* Nations yet to be formed, and who may be destined to possess conditions of society of which we have no conception, may of course find it practicable to adopt some such scheme of the *Impôt Unique* as *M. Emile de Girardin* (during his editorship of *La Presse* in 1848), and well-meaning theorists before him, have propounded. So long, however, as things are at all like what they have been, the maxim, *ne quid nimis*, must remain as applicable to direct, as to indirect, taxation; and it will be found that the unwelcome dose must be administered in that divided double form which experience has proved to be most effectual in circumstances of extreme trial.

It is certain, too, that if the Property and Income Tax be ever entirely given up, Statistics, important to the knowledge necessary for right administration, and, through it, to the welfare of the community, will be utterly lost, and our then want of information upon the means and condition of the heterogeneous ranks and classes of society would soon drift us back into the dark ages of high finance.

We must, however, recollect that the tide of prejudice can never be wholly removed; and that we are as far, now, as the public were in the Seventeenth Century, from a general and correct appreciation of the fact that direct and indirect taxation are,—in the Old World at least,—indissolubly united.

A clear notion of the real, as distinguished from the nominal incidence of newly imposed direct taxation, was put forward by that distinguished pioneer of the science of Political Arithmetic, Sir William Petty. We find him, as early as 1662, when his justly celebrated “Treatise on Taxes and Contributions” was first published, expressing views upon what would be the working of a Land-Tax, and showing that it did not, as a *New Tax*, fall exclusively as a burden upon the landlord; that, whilst it fell directly on rents, it at the same time fell indirectly on the produce of the rent; that the landlord generally was re-imbursed by rents rising, and the tenant by prices augmenting; and, finally, that it made the King’s Taxes more productive and more equitable.

And, although it is the opinion of the majority of Political Economists that a Land-Tax does not influence prices, it is, notwithstanding, highly probable that, in the state of things existing in the first half of the Seventeenth Century, it had a very material effect, and in the way laid down by Petty.

The acute mind and thoughtful temper of this eminent man did not allow him to confound the Landlord’s Income and the Tenant’s profit—the Schedule A and Schedule B of modern taxation;—neither did he entertain the opinions which induced Davenant, in the work, the authorship of which was the great event of that writer’s life,† to say that all Taxes whatsoever are, in their last resort, a charge upon land, a theory worthy of the doctrinal maxims of the school of

* This simile is but a homely one, it may, however, be the more truthful for that.

† The “*Essay upon Ways and Means*,” London, 1695.

physiocrats and economists which was about to form, in a neighbouring country.*

The passage from Sir W. Petty's Treatise, which has been referred to as especially deserving attention, is the following:—

"Suppose A and B have each of them a parcel of land of equal goodness and value; suppose also that A hath let his parcel for twenty-one years at twenty pounds *per annum*, but that B is free; now there comes out a tax of a fifth part; hereupon B will not let under 25*l.*, that his remainder may be twenty, whereas A must be contented with sixteen neat; nevertheless, the tenants of A will sell the proceed of their bargain at the same rate that the tenants of B shall do. The effect of all this is—first, that the King's fifth part of B, his farm, shall be greater than before. Secondly, that the farmer to B shall gain more than before the tax. Thirdly, that the tenant or farmer of A shall gain as much as the King and tenant to B both. *Fourthly, the tax doth ultimately light upon the landlord A and the consumptioners, from whence it follows that a land-tax resolves into an irregular excise upon consumption, that those bear it most who least complain.* And lastly, that some landlords may gain, and only such whose rents are predetermined, shall lose, and that doubly, viz., one way by the raising of their revenues, and the other by enhancing the prices of provisions upon them."

These arguments Petty would probably have taken means to impress more deeply in the public mind, had he not been pre-occupied with many other works and duties, and, prominently amongst these, with the Irish Surveys and with the foundation of the fortunes of the house of Shelburne.

* There can be little doubt that the ideas expressed by Petty, as to equal pound rates, bore their fruit in promoting the subsequent fixing of a settled *maximum* on real property, a plan which was extolled by Locke and Voltaire.

With reference to France, it may, perhaps, not be uninteresting to note that *Colbert*, soon after the peace of Nimeguen in 1679, had under his anxious consideration a plan for substituting an equal poundage, or *Taille réelle*, on real property, in the place of the partial, various, and uncertain systems which then prevailed in the different generalities and elections. This plan was interrupted by his death, and was not proceeded with further. The Manuscripts left by *Colbert* show that, like the equally illustrious Marshal Vauban, the study of the equity of taxation was a subject this minister had greatly at heart. It induced him, amidst the blaze of military glory, and the luxurious prodigality of the age of the Grand Monarque, to pen the words, "*Les Finances dans un Etat ont toujours esté et seront considérées comme la principale et la plus importante partie de sa gloire.*"

For interesting remarks on the *Taille, réelle*, and *personelle*, see the clever recent work of *M. Félix Joubleau*, entitled "*Etudes sur Colbert*," which received the *couronnement* of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences in January, 1856.

One of the ablest narratives of systems of direct taxation on the continent, from the middle ages down to present times, is that which has lately proceeded from the pen of *M. Esquirou de Parieu* Vice-President of the Imperial Council of State.

It is distinguished by careful study and analysis of freshly collected facts, applied with much critical judgment and practical knowledge. The author has our warmest congratulations on the successful treatment of the subject, which has elicited encomiums from the Ex-Minister *M. Hippolyte Passy* and other competent persons, and is worthy of the notice of British Statesmen.

The substance of the work first appeared in the numbers of the "*Journal des Economistes*," from which it has been reprinted in a separate form, with some additional chapters (Paris, Guillaumin et Cie.), under the title of "*Histoire des Impôts Généraux sur la Propriété et le Revenu*," par *M. F. Esquirou de Parieu*, Ancien Ministre de l'Instruction Publique et des Cultes, Vice-President du Conseil d'Etat, Membre de l'Institut.

But even if the statements in question are disposed of, there remains wanting a solution of an important subject of inquiry,—namely, *did Walpole, and those who in and since his days have adopted his views, base upon any, and, if so, upon what, statistical evidence, their allegations of the gross injustice and oppressive exaction of the tax, when the imposition on one part of the country is compared with that on another?*

Before proceeding to the examination of such data as the limited research within our power has been successful in collecting, as the basis upon which to construct a better digested system of calculation than it has been the fate of the question to encounter, it may be desirable to note, that even upon the bare figures of the Revenue from Land-Tax, as compared with that from other fiscal sources, the statements of Walpole upon the growing *gravamen* of the Tax, which elicited the “*hearems*” of the House, might have been proved to be little else than declamation without the support of facts.

The ratio of the Land-Taxes to the Revenue derived from all National Taxes had amounted to nearly 40 Per Cent. in the time of the Commonwealth. During the reign of William and Mary it had been nearly as high, viz., about 39 per Cent. In the reign of the first George it had fallen to 24 Per Cent.; and in that of his successor to about 23 Per Cent. Thus it had gradually diminished down to the time of Sir R. Walpole. And since then it has more and more decreased, until, with the growth of trade and the alterations which have ensued in the social ranks and relative wealth of the different classes of the community, it has, as a special separate Tax, been reduced to about 1½ Per Cent. of the Total Revenue from Taxes (as in the year 1856).

Since 1853, a tangible premium has, as we have before explained, been held out for its eventual entire extinction.

It will, in the next place, be interesting to inquire whether any contemporary, or earlier writers of acknowledged reputation, had taken up the same opinions as Sir R. Walpole on the Land-Tax. Without professing to go through the whole range of writers of the epoch, we may find evidence in support of these opinions in the writings of the Marquis of Halifax, and of Dr. Davenant.

Lord Halifax wrote but little, nevertheless, from his rank and talent, that little derived importance.

Davenant's writings touched upon the leading commercial and political subjects of the day, and attracted great attention. One, at least, of his Treatises was written at the instance of Lord Halifax, with whom a community of sentiment may be traced.*

* Dr. Charles Davenant, son of Sir William Davenant of dramatic celebrity, was born 1656; died 1714. He represented St. Ives *temp.* James II., and Great Bedwin in the Parliaments of 1698 and 1700; and at the time of his decease held the office of Inspector-General of the Exports and Imports. His works appeared at various periods between 1695 and 1712, and those printed before 1704 were under the periphrase of “The Author of the Essay on Ways and Means,” an affectation for which there was no reason, as he did not conceal his authorship. These works were collected and published, in five octavo volumes (London, 1771), by Sir Charles Whitworth, Member of Parliament, who professed also to have revised the text; but a more meagre exercise of the office of editor can scarcely be imagined.

Sir Charles Whitworth did not in fact venture on more than a few lines of com-

Upon the Land-Tax, their ideas were obviously identical, for we find the Marquis, in his "*Essay upon Taxes, calculated for the present juncture of affairs in England*" (1693), using nearly the same language as Davenant, in urgent protest,—“that the Land-Tax was “the most impolitic and unreasonable method of raising great sums “by that ever was introduced in any nation, and impossible to be “long borne and continued,”—the monthly assessment being, he declared, a military contribution taken up in the civil war, and proportioned to the state of the kingdom as it then stood, *i. e.*, forty years previously;—and “the inequality so exorbitant, both between “county and county, division and division, parish and parish, and “impossible to be rectified without a punctual survey of the whole,* “and lying wholly upon the landlord, where estates are not upon lives “or fines, wherein the dignified clergy pay not one groat, nor money “nor personal estate come in to the aid, and which lies so heavy “upon the nobility and gentry above all others, to the weakening “and diminishing their estates, who are the chief support of the “monarchy.”

Lord Halifax had, however, no such high opinion, as Davenant, of the advantage of an Excise in substitution for the Land-Tax; but he advocated a Property and Income Tax upon the ancient system of the subsidies, the assessors, and the parties paying, to be upon oath. Money and personal estate, not employed in trade, to be charged “double to land and trade” by the imposition of the old Subsidy Rates used from and before the reign of Henry the Eighth, viz., at Four Shillings in the Pound upon Real Estate, and Two Shillings and Eight pence upon Personal Estate calculated at 5 Per Cent. The survey of lands to be taken as fixed “once in an age” beyond reprises.—Personal estates and money to be assessed at their variable value, including Stock in trade and household stuff, but excluding wearing apparel.—Due allowance for debts to be made; also specified exemptions for a great number of children.—All Persons under Five Pounds in personal, and Three Pounds, in real property, to be excused.†

position on his own account, and these were couched in the most puerile style, for example:—

“The times in which he (*i. e.*, Davenant) chiefly wrote were soon after that “happy era of our English constitution by the accession of King William and “Queen Mary; therefore his discourses may be properly called the foundation of “our political establishment, as several public regulations have taken place from “the hints thrown out by the above author, &c.”

Dr. Davenant’s administrative talents are still remembered by some of the employés of the Custom House. They are favourably noticed in an appendix to the first Report of the Commissioners of Customs (20th February, 1857), where the fact is recalled to notice, that the system on which the office of Inspector-General of Imports and Exports commenced operations, “if not originally devised, was at “least improved by Dr. Davenant, the well-known writer on political economy, to “whom the charge of the office itself was committed shortly after its erection.”

* In reading this passage at the present time, the fallacy of the punctual survey, as exemplified in the unfinished *cadastre* undertaken in France for the *contribution foncière* since the Revolution of the close of the eighteenth century, will be kept in recollection.

† The “Fifths and Twentieths,” as the Land-Taxes were sometimes termed, do not apportion the ratios of real and personal estate on the oldest fashion: for it would appear that it was a prevailing maxim in ancient England, that the right

When Davenant, two years later, published his "*Essay on Ways and Means*" (1695), his views attracted general attention, particularly as they were supported, apparently, by the Statistics or Political Arithmetic of the figures which he introduced. And these figures, doubtless, convinced a large section of his contemporaries.

During the last century and a half, Davenant's deductions from his figures have been almost continuously cited as fully warranting his remarks on the gross injustice of the Land-Tax, which he put these forward as proving; and many eminent historians have quoted his views upon the subject, as of proved correctness.

But statisticians who may be content to take the trouble of further examination and comparison, and of computation where Davenant has only given the material for it, will find reason to doubt those views.

This part of the subject we now propose to consider; and it will be necessary for the purpose to give, textually, some of the leading accusations of Davenant against the Land-Tax. The following extracts are, therefore, subjoined:—

"The Land Taxes by monthly assessment seem unequally laid; and the pound-rate of four shillings in the pound does seem unequally levied upon the nation." (Introduction to "*Essay on Ways and Means*.")

"How ancient the inequality is between the Taxes in the north and west and the home counties, so much complained of, cannot easily be traced; for in an assessment of 400,000*l.*, 17 and 18 Car. I.. we find the rates upon the northern and western counties to lie just as they do in our present assessment; and though there might be some reason to ease the north in that tax, because those parts had been great sufferers by the Scotch army, yet, in 1642, when that Act passed, the sword of civil war was not as yet drawn; and the west and other counties had not as yet, at all, been harassed; so that the favour which the north and west have met with in land-taxes is a little older than the civil war, and may be attributed to that care, which the great number of members they send up have always had, of their concerns in parliament.

"When the civil war broke out, the commonwealth chiefly subsisted by excises, for they could gather land-taxes only where they were strongest.

"In 1647, their authority was generally owned over all the nation; and then they began to raise land-taxes regularly by a monthly assessment.

"When the war was over, there was real reason to ease the north and west, and accordingly the parliament considered what counties had least felt the war. Those in their assessments they rated highest, and they spared such places as had been most harassed by the armies of either side. And this was the distinction they made (and not as is vulgarly thought), that of associated or non-associated counties; for most

thing in taxation was "to charge money and personal estate not employed in trade, double to land and trade;" and tenderly to regard the condition of the very high and very low ranks of society. The middle classes had not at that time taken their share of power.

Lord Halifax seems to lean, with some degree of approval, on the idea of savings in personal estate of the "rich usurer or tradesman" being fair quarry for a double incidence of the property-tax. He quotes against the middle class the ancient saying that, in Taxes, "*size-cinq* was to be easy, *quatre-trois* to be fully charged, and *deuce-ace* to be exempted." He is by no means unhappy in his attempt to show that 2*s.* 8*d.* upon personal estate is equal to the double of 4*s.* upon real estate. The remarks under this head are, that "although 2*s.* 8*d.* may seem to be "less upon goods than 4*s.* upon lands; yet, when it is considered that lands are "rated according to the annual profits, and not their intrinsic value of purchase, "and that this is almost treble the profit of money at 5 per cent., and that all other "goods have no profit or interest to attend them, personal estate is more than "doubly charged."

counties of England, during that war, had been some time or other associated, and by ordinance of parliament.

"But still, perhaps, it had not fared so well with the north and west, notwithstanding their sufferings, if their cause had not been maintained in the House of Commons by a sufficient number of friends and advocates.

"The places which had been least sensible of those calamities, or were soonest rid of them, and that had been under the wings of the parliament, and their army, were London and Middlesex, Surrey and Southwark, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Kent, Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk, Berks, Bucks, and Oxfordshire.

"And they kept to the same measure of favouring the distant counties, and laying the chief burden upon those nearest London, as long as the authority of the commonwealth lasted.

"When King Charles the Second was restored, the northern and western gentlemen were strong enough in the House of Commons to get continued the method of assessment then in practice, which was so favourable to them; and in the Act 12 Car. II., for raising 70,000*l.* for one month, it is particularly provided, that it shall be raised in such proportion as the last 70,000*l.* per month was raised by ordinance of State; since which time, till now, the counties distant from London have continued in the constant possession of being favourably handled in all assessments.

"The first attempt of reducing assessments to some equality was made in the year 1660. The House of Commons, as may be seen from their journals (vol. viii., p. 178), had then in debate the settling 100,000*l.* per annum in compensation of the Court of Wards and Liveries; and a Committee was ordered to frame and bring in an equal apportionment of the said sum upon all the counties of England, which was done accordingly, and delivered to the House November the 8th, 1660, and is as followeth:—

	£		£
York-shire { West Riding 2,520	5,800	Warwick	1,800
{ North Riding 1,930		Worcester	1,800
{ East Riding 1,350		Bedford	1,400
Devon	5,000	Stafford	1,400
Essex	4,800	Nottingham	1,400
Kent	4,800	Derby	1,400
Suffolk	4,800	Lancashire.....	1,600
Norfolk	4,800	Cheshire.....	1,400
Somerset	4,000	Rutland.....	380
Bristol City	250	Huntingdon	900
Lincolnshire	4,000	Northumberland	700
Hampshire.....	3,000	Durham	700
Cornwall	2,400	Cumberland	400
Wiltshire	2,700	Westmoreland	300
London	4,000	Monmouth	800
Middlesex	3,000	Anglesea	260
Dorsetshire	2,000	Brecknock.....	450
Northampton.....	2,500	Cardigan.....	350
Gloucester.....	2,500	Carmarthen	450
Hertford	1,800	Carnarvon.....	260
Buckingham	1,900	Denbigh.....	450
Sussex	2,600	Flint	260
Surry	1,800	Glamorgan.....	700
Cambridge and Isle of Ely	1,800	Merioneth	220
Shropshire.....	1,900	Montgomery	550
Berkshire.....	1,700	Pembroke	500
Oxfordshire	1,700	Radnor	240
Leicester	1,800		
Hereford	1,600		
		TOTAL.....	£100,020

"This apportionment was many months in forming, and made, no doubt, with great deliberation and judgment, since all the most considerable men of those times were of that committee.

"It is apparent that, in the assessment of the rates upon each county, and by comparing the sums, it may be seen that they chiefly governed themselves by the proportions which had been observed in rating the ship-money.

"They had before them the assessment of the 400,000*l.*, 17 and 18 Car. I., which, because it was made in Parliament, they would, no doubt, have followed, if they had not judged it partial.

"But it seems they rather chose to follow the rates observed in assessing the ship-money, as having been laid by persons who had not the same reason and interest to favour one county more than another.

"Ship-money was an arbitrary and illegal tax, therefore it concerned the contrivers of it to lay it as equally upon the nation as possible; for it would have been a double grievance to the people if it had been imposed both against the law and also with partiality. On the contrary, it imported the ministers of that time to give their new invention all the fair colours imaginable, and to make that which was unjust in its nature at least just and equal in its manner; and no doubt, in the rating of it, they had duly weighed and considered the strength and weakness, riches and poverty, trade and fertility, and every circumstance of each particular county, with some regard also to the proportion it bore in the ancient subsidies.

"And, upon these grounds, it is more than probable the committee of the House of Commons proceeded in 1660, when they made the ship-money their model and pattern of a fair and equal assessment.

"Since the late war with France, land has been taxed in different manners, by an assessment and by a pound-rate; but both ways it will, perhaps, appear that the north and west have not borne their due share and proportion of the common burthen."—"Essay upon Ways and Means," 1695. "Of the Monthly Assessment and Aids upon a Pound-Rate.")

Dr. Davenant devotes about thirty pages of his treatise to an amplification of the views expressed in the preceding paragraphs upon the injustice of the assessment. Minute discussion would be tedious; but it has appeared that on the present occasion the best answer to them, and the most useful manner in which the judgment of future writers on the subject of Land-Tax may be assisted, is to collect in one view a digested statement, showing the comparative incidence of the various Assessments upon every part of the country from the time of Charles the First down to recent dates. The results, arrived at with considerable labour, are arranged in the TABLE E, which will be made the subject of some concluding general remarks.

And as it is of special importance to show what materials have been employed as the basis on which to construct that Table, full particulars will be found, in chronological order, after the Table itself, which occupies the next six pages.

Following the statement of the data upon which the results have been computed, an illustrative example is then given of the way in which the Table is to be read, although the need of such an indication is almost superseded by the full explanatory headings of the Table.

The paper is concluded with some general observations, arising from a consideration of this Table and of the Abstract of its results contained in APPENDIX II.

TABLE E.

Collective View of the PROPORTIONATE LAND-TAX QUOTAS

SECTION I.								
DISTRIBUTION OF LAND-TAX.—ENGLAND AND WALES.								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
DIVISIONS AND COUNTIES.	A.D. 1636. <i>Land-Tax. (Ship- money.)</i>	A.D. 1642. <i>Land-Tax of Four Hundred Thousand Pounds. (17 and 18 Car. 1)</i>	A.D. 1644. <i>Land-Tax Weekly Assess- ment per Ordinance of Parliament for Irish Rebellion.</i>	A.D. 1656. <i>Land-Tax Common- wealth Monthly Assess- ment for Spanish War, &c.</i>	A.D. 1660. <i>Estimated Land-Tax Assess- ment in lieu of Court of Wards and Liveries.</i>	A.D. 1691. <i>Land-Tax Monthly Assess- ment. 2 Gul. et Mar.</i>	A.D. 1692 to 1798, <i>Real Quotas; and A.D. 1798 to 1857, Nominal Quotas; of Land-Tax.</i>	A.D. 1843. <i>Real Quotas of Land-Tax Proportion Unre- deemed to Total Unre- deemed.</i>
Proportions in which each Division and County contributed to the Totals raised	<i>Per Cent. of Assessment on England and Wales.</i>	<i>Per Cent., &c.</i>	<i>Per Cent., &c.</i>	<i>Per Cent., &c.</i>	<i>Per Cent., &c.</i>	<i>Per Cent., &c.</i>	<i>Per Cent., &c.</i>	<i>Per Cent., &c.</i>
I.—LONDON AND MIDDLESEX.								
1. Middlesex, in- cluding London and Westminster	9·75	13·60	10·51	9·25	7·00	10·65	16·39	13·08
II.—SOUTH- EASTERN.								
2. Surrey.....	1·69	2·68	2·06	2·24	1·80	2·32	3·32
3. Kent	3·86	5·24	5·15	5·24	4·80	4·84	4·15
4. Sussex	2·42	2·71	2·57	2·73	2·60	2·65	3·02
5. Hants	2·90	3·64	3·09	2·90	3·00	3·18	2·76
6. Berks	1·93	1·40	2·27	1·56	1·70	1·64	2·06
	12·80	15·67	15·14	14·67	13·90	14·63	15·31	13·52
III.—SOUTH- MIDLAND.								
7. Hertford	1·93	1·87	1·61	2·01	1·80	1·96	2·12
8. Buckingham	2·18	1·67	1·73	1·84	1·90	1·91	2·37
9. Oxford	1·69	1·59	1·65	1·61	1·70	1·65	1·95
10. Northampton ..	2·90	1·21	1·75	2·01	2·60	2·06	2·39
11. Huntingdon ..	0·97	0·87	0·90	0·89	0·90	0·92	0·78
12. Bedford	1·44	1·09	1·03	1·34	1·40	1·30	1·44
13. Cambridge	1·69	2·10	2·20	2·10	1·80	1·99	1·64
	12·80	10·40	10·87	11·80	12·00	11·79	12·69	13·60
IV.—EASTERN.								
14. Essex	3·86	4·47	4·64	5·01	4·80	4·50	4·49
15. Suffolk	3·86	5·11	5·15	5·24	4·80	4·79	3·69
16. Norfolk	3·78	6·07	5·15	5·46	4·80	5·16	4·24
	11·50	15·65	14·94	15·71	14·40	14·45	12·42	13·60

from the 17th to the 19th Century.

SECTION II.

DISTRIBUTION OF REAL PROPERTY.—ENGLAND AND WALES.

DIVISIONS AND COUNTIES.	10	11	12	13	14	15			16	17	18
	A.D. 1692.	A.D. 1692.	A.D. 1814.	A.D. 1851.	A.D. 1850-1.	<i>Growth of Annual Value.</i>					
	<i>Amount of Annual Value of Real Property.</i>	<i>Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.</i>	<i>Proportion of each Division to Total Annual Value.</i>	<i>Property Tax, Schedule A. Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.</i>	<i>Property Assessed to Poor's Rates. Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.</i>	122 Yrs.	37 Yrs.	159 Yrs.			
						A.D. 1692 to 1814.	A.D. 1814 to 1851.	A.D. 1692 to 1851.	<i>Amount of Annual Value of Real Property.</i>		
<i>Proportions in which each Division and County contributed to the Totals.</i>	<i>Millions Sterling, and Decimals.</i>	<i>Per Cent.</i>	<i>Per Cent.</i>	<i>Per Cent.</i>	<i>Per Cent.</i>	<i>Increase Per Cent.</i>	<i>Increase Per Cent.</i>	<i>Increase Per Cent.</i>	<i>Millions Sterling, and Decimals.</i>		
I.—LONDON AND MIDDLESEX.	£								£		
1. Middlesex, including London and Westminster	1·631	16·39	10·77	14·63	11·99	254·	141·	850·	13·868		
II.—SOUTH- EASTERN.											
2. Surrey.....	0·331	3·32	4·18	3·54	3·964		
3. Kent.....	0·413	4·15	3·33	3·55	3·152		
4. Sussex.....	0·300	3·02	1·89	2·01	1·796		
5. Hants.....	0·275	2·76	1·92	2·14	1·820		
6. Berks.....	0·204	2·06	1·03	1·16	0·978		
	1·523	15·31	11·50	12·35	12·40	304·	81·	669·	11·710		
III.—SOUTH- MIDLAND.											
7. Hertford.....	0·211	2·12	0·92	1·09	0·870		
8. Buckingham....	0·236	2·37	0·92	1·05	0·875		
9. Oxford.....	0·194	1·95	1·07	1·05	1·013		
10. Northampton....	0·238	2·39	1·37	1·44	1·297		
11. Huntingdon....	0·077	0·78	0·41	0·45	0·390		
12. Bedford.....	0·143	1·44	0·60	0·62	0·566		
13. Cambridge.....	0·163	1·64	1·20	1·28	1·138		
	1·262	12·69	8·18	6·49	6·98	247·	44·	387·	6·149		
IV.—EASTERN.											
14. Essex.....	0·447	4·49	2·07	2·49	1·961		
15. Suffolk.....	0·368	3·69	1·93	2·02	1·834		
16. Norfolk.....	0·421	4·24	2·60	2·75	2·464		
	1·236	12·42	7·94	6·60	7·26	244·	47·	407·	6·259		

TABLE E.—
Collective View of the PROPORTIONATE LAND-TAX QUOTAS

SECTION I. DISTRIBUTION OF LAND-TAX.—ENGLAND AND WALES.								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
DIVISIONS AND COUNTIES.	A.D. 1636. <i>Land-Tax.</i> (Ship- money)	A.D. 1642. <i>Land-Tax</i> of Four Hundred Thousand Pounds. (17 and 18 Car. I.)	A.D. 1644. <i>Land-Tax</i> Weekly Assess- ment per Ordinance of Parliament for Irish Rebellion.	A.D. 1656. <i>Land-Tax</i> Common- wealth Monthly Assess- ment for Spanish War, &c.	A.D. 1660. Estimated <i>Land-Tax</i> Assess- ment in lieu of Court of Wards and Liveries.	A.D. 1691. <i>Land-Tax</i> Monthly Assess- ment. (2 Gul. et Mar.)	A.D. 1692 to 1798, <i>Real</i> Quotas; and A.D. 1798 to 1857, <i>Nominal</i> Quotas; of Land-Tax.	A.D. 1843. Real Quotas of Land-Tax. Proportion Unre- deemed to Total Unre- deemed.
Proportions in which each Division and County contributed to the Totals raised	<i>Per Cent. of Assessment on England and Wales.</i>	Per Cent., &c.	Per Cent., &c.	Per Cent., &c.	Per Cent., &c.	Per Cent., &c.	Per Cent., &c.	Per Cent., &c.
V.—SOUTH- WESTERN.								
17. Wilts	3·38	2·90	2·99	2·79	2·70	2·86	2·60
18. Dorset	2·42	1·93	1·81	1·89	2·00	1·96	1·66
19. Devon	4·35	7·46	7·62	4·46	5·00	4·86	4·15
20. Cornwall	2·65	2·51	2·57	2·34	2·40	2·24	1·61
21. Somerset	4·35	4·42	4·56	4·15	4·25	4·32	3·64
	17·15	19·22	19·55	15·63	16·35	16·24	13·66	14·45
VI.—WEST- MIDLAND.								
22. Gloucester	2·65	2·75	3·35	2·57	2·50	2·69	2·38
23. Hereford	1·69	1·78	1·80	1·67	1·60	1·64	1·03
24. Salop	2·18	1·13	1·55	1·89	1·90	1·75	1·46
25. Stafford	1·45	0·95	0·90	1·34	1·40	1·26	1·36
26. Worcester	1·69	1·53	2·33	1·78	1·80	1·61	1·69
27. Warwick	1·94	1·43	2·47	1·78	1·80	1·73	2·00
	11·60	9·57	12·40	11·03	11·00	10·68	9·92	10·61
VII. NORTH- MIDLAND.								
28. Leicester	2·18	0·95	0·77	1·56	1·80	1·58	1·74
29. Rutland	0·39	0·26	0·26	0·39	0·37	0·35	0·28
30. Lincoln	3·86	3·34	3·35	3·90	4·00	3·74	3·62
31. Nottingham	1·69	0·75	0·77	1·34	1·40	1·27	1·37
32. Derby	1·69	0·70	0·72	1·34	1·40	1·25	1·21
	9·81	6·00	5·87	8·53	8·97	8·19	8·22	9·79
VIII.—NORTH- WESTERN.								
33. Chester	1·45	0·79	0·98	1·22	1·40	1·17	1·44
34. Lancaster	0·48	1·08	2·06	1·34	1·60	1·46	1·05
	1·93	1·87	3·04	2·56	3·00	2·63	2·49	2·75

1857.] *Territorial Distribution, of Tax, and of Real Property.* 291

Continued.

from the 17th to the 19th Century.

SECTION II.

DISTRIBUTION OF REAL PROPERTY.—ENGLAND AND WALES.

DIVISIONS AND COUNTIES.	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	A.D. 1692.	A.D. 1692.	A.D. 1814.	A.D. 1851.	A.D. 1850-1.	Growth of Annual Value.			A.D. 1851.
	Amount of Annual Value of Real Property.	Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.	Proportion of each Division to Total Annual Value.	Property Tax, Schedule A. Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.	Property Assessed to Poor's Rates. Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.	132 Yrs.	37 Yrs.	159 Yrs.	Amount of Annual Value of Real Property.
						A.D. 1692 to 1814.	A.D. 1814 to 1851.	A.D. 1692 to 1851.	
Proportions in which each Division and County contributed to the Totals raised	Millions Sterling, and Decimals.	Per Cent.	Per Cent.	Per Cent.	Per Cent.	Increase Per Cent.	Increase Per Cent.	Increase Per Cent.	Millions Sterling, and Decimals.
V.—SOUTH- WESTERN.	£								£
17. Wilts	0.258	2.60	1.56	1.75	1.475
18. Dorset	0.166	1.66	1.02	1.11	0.971
19. Devon	0.413	4.15	2.89	2.98	2.736
20. Cornwall	0.160	1.61	1.42	1.37	1.350
21. Somerset	0.362	3.64	3.28	3.02	3.112
	1.359	13.66	13.26	10.17	10.23	422.	36.	609.	9.644
VI.—WEST- MIDLAND.									
22. Gloucester	0.237	2.38	2.36	2.90	2.236
23. Hereford	0.102	1.03	0.86	0.99	0.816
24. Salop	0.145	1.46	1.65	1.77	1.563
25. Stafford	0.136	1.36	2.99	2.88	2.834
26. Worcester	0.168	1.69	1.51	1.48	1.428
27. Warwick	0.199	2.00	2.56	2.58	2.431
	0.987	9.92	11.80	11.93	12.60	541.	79.	1047.	11.308
VII. NORTH- MIDLAND.									
28. Leicester	0.173	1.74	1.44	1.43	1.364
29. Rutland	0.028	0.28	0.17	0.19	0.160
30. Lincoln	0.360	3.62	3.17	3.28	3.009
31. Nottingham	0.136	1.37	1.26	1.39	1.199
32. Derby	0.120	1.21	2.11	1.56	2.000
	0.817	8.22	9.01	8.15	7.85	490.	60.	845.	7.732
VIII.—NORTH- WESTERN.									
33. Chester	0.143	1.44	2.18	2.35	2.062
34. Lancaster	0.105	1.05	9.11	9.77	8.641
	0.248	2.49	7.94	11.29	12.12	1616.	151.	4217.	10.703

*Continued.**from the 17th to the 19th Century.*

SECTION II.									
DISTRIBUTION OF REAL PROPERTY.—ENGLAND AND WALES.									
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	A.D. 1692.	A.D. 1692.	A.D. 1814.	A.D. 1851.	A.D. 1850-1.	<i>Growth of Annual Value.</i>			A.D. 1851.
						192 Yrs.	37 Yrs.	159 Yrs.	
DIVISIONS AND COUNTIES.	<i>Amount of Annual Value of Real Property.</i>	<i>Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.</i>	<i>Proportion of each Division to Total Annual Value.</i>	<i>Property Tax, Schedule A. Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.</i>	<i>Property Assessed to Poor's Rates. Proportion of each County to Total Annual Value.</i>	<i>A.D. 1692 to 1814.</i>	<i>A.D. 1814 to 1851.</i>	<i>A.D. 1692 to 1851.</i>	<i>Amount of Annual Value of Real Property.</i>
	Millions Sterling, and Decimals.	Per Cent.	Per Cent.	Per Cent.	Per Cent.	Increase Per Cent.	Increase Per Cent.	Increase Per Cent.	Millions Sterling, and Decimals.
<i>IX.—YORK.</i>	£								£
35. North, East, and West Ridings	0·457	4·60	8·89	8·63	8·73	941·	72·	1688·	8·181
<i>X.—NORTHERN.</i>									
36. Durham	0·053	0·53	1·77	1·55	1·680
37. Northumberland	0·073	0·73	1·65	1·86	1·561
38. Cumberland	0·019	0·19	1·01	1·05	0·963
39. Westmoreland...	0·015	0·15	0·37	0·41	0·353
	0·160	1·60	6·00	4·80	4·87	1915·	42·	2756·	4·557
<i>XI.—WELSH.</i>									
40. Monmouth.....	0·049	0·49	0·75	0·72	0·711
<i>South Wales.</i>									
41. Glamorgan	0·850
42. Carmarthen	0·386
43. Pembroke	0·359
44. Cardigan	0·217
45. Brecon	0·229
46. Radnor	0·146
(Total, S. Wales)	0·113	1·14	2·31	2·46	2·187
<i>North Wales.</i>									
47. Montgomery	0·340
48. Flint	0·399
49. Denbigh	0·432
50. Merioneth	0·168
51. Carnarvon	0·289
52. Anglesey.....	0·173
(Total, N. Wales)	0·107	1·07	1·90	1·79	1·801
(Total, Welsh)	2·269	2·70	4·71	4·96	4·97	839·	86·	1648·	4·699
ENGLAND & WALES	9·948	100·00	100·00	100·00	100·00	438·	77·	853·	94·809

I.—*The Ship-Money Assessment of the year 1636.* This celebrated Land-Tax, which had been in operation before this date, by its imposition partially on certain counties, was at length settled into definite amounts of Contribution or Quotas upon every County in England and Wales. Davenant extols (as has been seen) the superior care and accuracy with which these quotas were framed. He gives the respective figures for each county.

For the purpose of the present inquiry, this and the other assessments of the Seventeenth Century have been re-arranged into divisions or groups, and have been brought to a common standard of exactly calculated Per-Centages, for comparison with each other and with the subsisting ratios of the Land-Tax.* See Col. 2 of TABLE E.

II.—*The Assessment of 17 and 18 Charles I., Year 1642.* This assessment of 403,159*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.*, upon England and Wales, arose out of one of the Irish rebellions, and is referred to in the special order of the House of Commons, 9th April, 1642, concerning the free offer of the County of Buckingham to lend 6,000*l.*, upon the Act of Contribution for the affairs of Ireland, and promising repayment out of the first moneys that shall be raised in that county upon the Bill of Four Hundred Thousand Pounds.

It will be recollected that Davenant, who gives the amount of the quotas under this Land-Tax, remarks upon its being partial and favouring certain counties. The computed Per-Centages, in Col. 3 of TABLE E, will show this impression to have been unfounded as regards any considerable discrepancy; and that, *if* favouritism did occur, the figures of the Ship-Money with which Davenant challenges comparison, indicate a comparatively lighter assessment upon several of the particular parts of the country that are erroneously stated by him to have been favoured by the quotas of 1642, which are, particularly in the South-Western counties, really charged at higher proportionate rates by the Assessment of 1642, than by the Ship-Money.

III.—*An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, for the speedy raising and levying of Money for the maintenance of the Army raised by the Parliament, and other great affairs of the Commonwealth, by a weekly Assessment upon the Cities of London and Westminster, and every County and City of the Kingdom of England and Dominion of Wales, 1st March, 1642-3.*

This Ordinance does not appear in the Collection printed by Special Order of Parliament during the Protectorate, known as Scobell's Collection (London, 1658, Folio).

* There is no evidence in Davenant's works that he was acquainted with the usefulness of the decimal system. His comparisons throughout are upon approximate vulgar fractions, and of a confused character. We do not say they were wilfully erroneous, as that is questionable, and would require collateral evidence which the lapse of time has rendered it hopeless to look for; and, under such circumstances, any author is properly entitled to the benefit of the doubt. We do not agree with Chalmers that Davenant acted unjustly towards Gregory King in other statistical matters, or that he much "garbled" the statements of the latter. Mr. Macaulay, in his History of England, has, perhaps, written on this subject of the great accuracy of King, and of Davenant's unfair use of King's figures, with too much reliance on Chalmers's overdrawn appreciation of King's Political Arithmetic.

It was, however, printed by order of Parliament, 4th March, 1643, and will be found in the remarkable Volume entitled "An Exact Collection of all Remonstrances, Declarations, Votes, &c., &c., beginning at his Majestie's Return from Scotland, being in December, 1641, and continued until March the 21st, 1643."—(London, printed for Edward Husbards, &c., Quarto, 1643).

The total weekly sum proposed to be raised under this Ordinance is not stated; but, on addition, we find it to be 33,971*l.* 3*s.* The proportions are given for the several Counties and Towns.* On re-arranging and tabulating them, the assessment does not seem to be an appropriate one to place in juxtaposition with the other assessments in a general statement, as the metropolis was exceptionally charged at a much higher ratio than any other place, with, however, the saving clause that, "Whereas, the rates set by this Ordinance "upon the city of London, the city of Westminster, and the Suburbs "thereof, farre exceed the proportion of other Counties, the same "shall not hereafter be drawn into example or consequence to their "prejudice, but shall be understood as a marke of their bounty and "faithful service to the Commonwealth."*

The assessment upon London, Westminster, and Middlesex together, on this occasion, amounted to about 35½ per Cent. of the total; but, on carefully subdividing the items into Divisions, as with the other data in TABLE E, it appears that the respective *order* of magnitude of the proportionate amounts of contribution corresponded (excepting London and Westminster) exactly with the *order* in the assessment of the following year, 1644.

IV.—*An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament for raising of Fourscore Thousand Pounds, by a weekly assessment through the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, for the present relief of the British Army in Ireland, and to continue for the space of Twelve months from the first day of September, 1644.*

This ordinance is dated 16th October, 1644, and was published in a printed form the ensuing week. It is not to be found in any collection of the Statutes; but, fortunately for the object of the present paper, an original printed copy is in the writer's possession. The figures it contains have been carefully re-arranged and made the basis of the calculations in Col. 4 of TABLE E.

V.—*Ordinance of His Highness the Lord Protector, Anno 1656, cap. 12. Assessment upon England and Wales at the rate of Sixty Thousand Pounds, by the Month, for Three Months, towards the maintenance of the Spanish War, &c.*

This ordinance is given in Scobell's Collection, pages 400-424. Col. 5 of our TABLE E is calculated on its basis.

* Probably it would not be a wrong conclusion, that, almost always in these matters of taxation, the greatest sufferers were the least complainers; and that the loudly grumbling country gentleman was substantially less entitled to commiseration than the hardworking citizen.—That the Londoners bore the heat and burden of the Tax Gatherer's onslaught on the purses of the community is pretty evident from the curious pamphlet entitled "London's Account, or a Calculation of the Arbytrary and Tyrannical Exactions, Taxation, Impositions, Subsidies, Twentieth Parts, and other Assessments, during Time past of this unnatural Warre, what the Total Summe Amounts unto, &c.," London, 1647, 4to.

Sir John Sinclair ("History of the Public Revenue of the British Empire," vol. i. p. 306) refers to this ordinance. He does not quote its results, but gives an alphabetical list of the assessments on the several Counties, under an Ordinance of 1660, which, he states, "he was so fortunate to meet with." Sir John Sinclair does not, however, make any analysis of the *proportions*, and, after careful comparison, it would seem there are some omissions on his part (and perhaps in the Assessment of Exeter, Berwick, and Haverfordwest), which interfere with the complete accuracy of his list.

Led by his statement to the impression that there was something novel in this Assessment of 1660, we were surprised to find that Sir John Sinclair did not apply so much of calculation to the figures as would have shown him, that they are *in precisely the same ratio* as the Assessment in Scobell, of the year 1656, just described. The *amounts*, it is true, are different, but the alteration being an addition of One-sixth part throughout the *proportions* are not interfered with.

VI.—*The Land-Tax Assessment of November, 1660.* This arose out of the extremely important surrender by Charles the Second of the remains of the feudal prerogatives of the Crown, which had been enjoyed as a source of income during the republican period.* This assessment was not actually levied; the calculations were made to apportion the compensation of 100,000*l.* per annum as a Tax upon Land, in lieu of those feudal prerogatives which, for Six Hundred years previously, had been incidents on its tenure, the King having rights to fines on Marriage, Wardship, &c. In later times this Revenue had been collected through the Court of Wards and Liveries on the abolition of which the assessments were settled. But the landed interests succeeded in shifting the proposed annual burden of 100,000*l.* from their Real Property and transferring it to the beer, ale, and wine-barrels of the people. This was the origin of the hereditary excise granted in compensation to the Crown for its Revenue from the Court of Wards and Liveries.

Davenant is certainly in error when he states that the Ship-Money assessment was followed in settling the amounts upon each County on this occasion in 1660. The calculations re-arranged in Col. 6 of TABLE E, compared with Col. 2 Land-Tax, or Ship-Money of 1636, and Col. 5 Land-Tax assessment of 1656, will fully prove his mistake.

VII.—*The aid upon Land, granted in 1691, being the fifth Land-Tax of the reign of William and Mary (Act 2 Gul. et Mar.), and the last previously to the final settlement of 1692.*

John Houghton, an author whose works are specially noticeable, although they have not secured as much mention as they deserve from modern writers,† published, in January, 1693, a large Folio

* Vide "Observations on the Land Revenue of the Crown" (by Mr. St. John), 1st edition, London, 1787. Also Sinclair, Hist., vol. i., p. 300-1, on Feudal Prerogatives and origin of the hereditary excise.

† Houghton deserves honourable notice in the list of able and industrious labourers in the diffusion of useful knowledge.

By occupation an apothecary, he kept a shop in St. Bartholomew Lane, behind the

Sheet, which he fully described in Nos. 25 to 32, Vol. II., of his weekly Penny Periodical or Magazine entitled "A Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade." This broadside must be

Royal Exchange, and particularly advertised his dealing in Chocolate and in Spa-Water, but the former article was decidedly his specialty.

He was a Fellow of the Royal Society, and enjoyed the particular confidence and assistance in his literary undertakings of such eminent men as Dr. Halley, John Evelyn, Samuel Pepys, Sloane, Plot, and others of the leading members of the Royal Society, several of whom became contributors to his works.

On the 8th September, 1681, Houghton published No. 1 of his Quarto "Collection of Letters for the Improvement of Trade," and, in about a year and a-half, had published Fifteen numbers, forming his first volume. Each number contained from eight to twenty-two pages; and any one in London or Westminster could have them delivered at their own houses on payment of a penny per sheet.

Volume II. of the Quarto Tracts appeared some time between 1683 and 1693; but we have only the first volume. One of its papers, No. 13, for Tuesday, Feb. 13, 1683, is worthy of special attention, as showing the early appreciation of Graunt's sketch of a Table of Mortality. The paper is headed "Some Considerations upon the Proposals approved on by the City of London for Subscriptions on Lives, wherein are some Observations and Conjectures upon the East India Company, and Bankers." The proposals referred to amounted to a Tontine Scheme, and Graunt's Table of Mortality, in Decads of Age, is applied to determining the probable ratio of Survivorship. It is observable that Houghton identifies Petty's labours with Graunt's, saying—"Major Graunt, or rather that learned and ingenious virtuoso, "Sir William Petty, in his admirable observations of the Bills of Mortality of "London, &c., &c. This great man" (*query*, is Graunt or Petty meant) "saith, &c."

On the 30th March, 1692, Houghton commenced publishing his folio weekly "Collection for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade." Between that date and 24th September, 1703, he issued 583 numbers, each of four pages. The price was at first Two Pence, but was soon reduced to One Penny. This periodical, or Penny Magazine, contained articles of remarkable usefulness, and replete with information interesting alike to the farmer, the man of science, and the general public. And they are also valuable to the student of Political Economy, as including some analyses of Trade Statistics and Prices at an important period in its history.

The statistician may consult with advantage a paper on the Acreage of England and Wales, calculated by Dr. Halley from the carefully ascertained *weights* of the component parts of a large Map which that philosopher dissected into Counties, and, by means of his balance and estimates, came, in most of his details (if we consider the circumstances), surprisingly near to the calculations of Major Dawson on the occasion of the Last Census of 1851.

The Folio papers of Houghton (omitting, however, the curious advertisements, the Wind and Rain Tables, the Stock and Share Lists, the weekly prices of Corn in various parts of the country, the prices in the Provision and other Markets, and the condensed narrative of news from the London Gazette) were reprinted Twenty-Four Years after, in three Volumes Octavo, London, 1727, revised, with a preface and indexes by Richard Bradley, F.R.S., Professor of Botany in the University of Cambridge.

Bradley observed, that he "had the greatest pleasure in the opportunity of "restoring to the world Mr. Houghton's useful writings, which, in all probability, "would never else have been again published; and" (he went on to say) "it is very "likely that there are not, in all our English libraries, ten complete sets; for, as "they were published in single papers, many of them were undoubtedly lost, and "the few that are now left are esteemed as valuable as choice manuscripts."

From sundry advertisements in various single numbers now before us, and from occasional remarks in the text, it appears that Houghton was, very likely, peculiarly a loser by the publication. He consoles himself, however, with becoming patriotism; and there is no trace of his having been reduced to that miserable bondage which the literary men of his time usually had to endure, that is, either to court a patron of rank or wealth, or else to put up with a hard crust and a garret.

honourably distinguished from the catchpenny publications which frequently adopted that popular form, and is a remarkable essay to make the elementary statistics of direct taxation understood by the general public. Its title is "An Account of the Acres and Houses, with the proportional Tax, &c., of each county in England and Wales humbly presented to the Lords and Commons." Against each county and separately assessed town are given the figures of the Monthly Tax, the proportional tax in decimals, the number of Acres and Houses, Parts (not decimally, but reciprocally) of the whole Tax, Acres, Houses, Acres per house, Year's Tax (in Shillings and pence) per Acre and per House.

This account, omitting some remarks which preface it, and are not material to the object, was reprinted in Vol. V. of the Parliamentary History (1811, *vide* Appendix X., p. 103). Singularly enough, the proportional tax in Decimals, which is the chief feature, and professedly so, of the original, is entirely omitted in this reprint; but we have been enabled to make good the omission by supplying the missing figures from our original copy of the Broadside. These are re-arranged into divisions or groups in Column 7 of TABLE E. But we have curtailed the *Nine* decimal places to which Houghton carried his calculations to the more convenient extent of *Two* places.*

VIII.—*The Land-Tax of 1692.* This Assessment, the most important of all, in a modern point of view, as fixing the nominal quotas still in force, and which, as explained in PART I of this article, were the real Quotas between the years 1692 and 1797, was levied under the Act of 4 Gul. et Mar., c. 1, "for granting to their majesties "an aid of four shillings in the pound, for one year, for carrying on "a vigorous war against France."

* However ingenious the calculations of Houghton upon Land-Tax may be considered, we think his conclusions, based as they are upon the ratio of the Tax to the *Acreage*, quite unsound. We shall hereafter have to consider whether the same course of ideas did not warp the judgment of Davenant in making him think that the number of houses, and the hearth-money returns, were better guides to a just assessment than the quotas fixed by the Commissioners of Land-Tax, and approved by Parliament. In order to fully explain Houghton's views, the following extracts from his own words on the subject will be quite sufficient:—

"Of the proportional tax in Decimals, I have the whole computation by me. "With it, an arithmetician, in two or three hours, may proportion each county's "share of any number of thousand pounds whatsoever shall be laid. And if it "should be laid wholly on *Acres*, or *Houses*, it would prove near as in the Table, "in which I remark, that London, or the Lord Mayor's jurisdiction only, without "the suburbs in Middlesex and Southwark, bears near the Sixteenth part of the "Tax. That Middlesex, abstracted from London (the Lord Mayor's jurisdiction), "bears near the Two and Twentieth and half part of the Tax; and both together, "abstracted from Southwark, bears the Ninth and Half part of the Tax; that "Cumberland bears but One Penny the Acre towards the tax; but Middlesex " (including London) bears Five Shillings and Eleven Pence the *Acre*. That York-shire has about the Tenth and Half part of the Acres of the whole *kingdom*, the "Eleventh part of the *Houses* (much about the same number with the Bills of "Mortality), and bears about the Twentieth part of the Tax. It seems to me, that "the places *over-charged* have about 150 Parliament men; those *under-charged* "about 130 men; those that have no reason to complain about 220 men. Whether "this Table may show reason for alteration of the method of Taxing, I submit to "proper judges. The matter of fact I here endeavour to demonstrate; and am, my "Lords and Gentlemen, your most obedient Servant, JOHN HOUGHTON, F.R.S."

Col. 8 of TABLE E shows the nominal proportion borne by each County and Division to the whole Tax.

IX.—The following Col. 9, of the same Table, shows the alteration in these nominal proportions, which, through the operation of the Land-Tax Redemption Act, as more fully set forth in the Tables of Part I of this article, have occurred in each County and Group of Counties. The figures are for 1843, but they represent, with sufficient nearness, the status for the present year, 1857.

X.—The concluding Cols., 10 to 18 inclusive, of TABLE E, are calculated with the idea that they will afford as close an approximate indication as can be obtained of the distribution of real property through the several parts of England and Wales in the Seventeenth, and in the Nineteenth, Century. Besides the intrinsic interest of these Statistics, they form the most important test which can be applied to the proportionate comparative statistics of Land-Tax at the various periods.

One or two points require explanation, viz., as to the introduction of the Real Property Valuation in 1814, and as to Cols. 12, 15, 16, 17 not being filled up for each county. The explanation is, that it is not uninteresting to see whether the changes which have occurred in the distribution of Real Property have been of recent occurrence, or prior to the time of the last valuation made between the expiry of the old Property and Income Tax and the imposition of the new one. As regards the valuation of real property in 1692, the amounts are sufficiently near, notwithstanding a small proportion of personal property and Pensions are included. The reason for each County's increase not being filled up is, that the Divisions lead the eye, with sufficient nearness, to those parts of the country where the chief increase has taken place, and the amounts in millions sterling of the real Property value in each county almost give the answer by inspection, we have, on these grounds, not deemed the labour of further calculation necessary.

Further Explanation as to Method of reading TABLE E.

An example, chosen with no particular preference, but merely to show the uses to which the TABLE E may be applied, and the way in which the several hundred calculations it contains are to be read, may here be found useful.

*Example.—DIVISION IV. EASTERN.—Three Counties, Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk.—Assessment to the Ship-Money Land-Tax of 1636. Of every 100*l.* raised by this Tax, Essex had to contribute 3·86*l.*, Suffolk 3·86*l.*, Norfolk 3·78*l.* Total, 11·5*l.*, i. e., 11*l.* 10*s.* of each 100*l.*, or 11½ Per Cent. of the Tax.*

Assessment of Four Hundred Thousand Pounds, per Land-Tax Act of 1642, 17 and 18 Charles I. In this case the Assessment on Essex was raised to 4·47 Per Cent., on Suffolk to 5·11 Per Cent., on Norfolk to 6·07 Per Cent., Total 15·65 Per Cent. But as it may be tedious to recapitulate the Items of each County, and which may be seen by inspection of TABLE E, we will merely repeat the Totals of this Eastern Division for the remainder of the Columns. It will then be seen that the Total of 1642, just referred to, was reduced, in 1644, to 14·94 Per Cent. by the Weekly Assessment per Ordinance

of Parliament for suppressing the Irish Rebellion of the Year 1644. In 1656, it was again raised to a little beyond the proportion of 1656, viz., to 15·71 per Cent., in the case of the *Commonwealth Monthly Assessment for the Spanish War*. In 1660, the Commissioners, who estimated the *Land-Tax Assessment in compensation for the abolition of the Court of Wards and Liveries*, assessed the Counties comprising this Division at Sums which, instead of realizing Davenant's ideas that they were in close conformity, and, in fact, proceeded on the basis of the Ship-Money Land-Tax Assessments, are, on the contrary, shown to be nearer to the other assessments which he condemned as unjust; and the figures on this occasion give a Per-Centage of 14·4 Per Cent.

Passing on to the year 1691, when an elaborate investigation would seem to have been made into some of the Statistics of Real Property by the Land-Tax Commissioners, in rating the *Monthly Assessment or Aid upon Land of the 2 William and Mary*, the figures for this Division give a Total of 14·45 Per Cent.

In the next year, viz., 1692, we arrive at the point which connects the ancient and modern statistics; for, in this sense at least, the proportionate Quotas of 1692 are modern, inasmuch as they were continued in their integrity until 1797; and, from 1798 down to the present date, made perpetual and subject to redemption. The Quotas under this Act (Real Quotas from 1692-1797, nominal Quotas from 1797-1857, but real Quotas even during the latter period if we were to admit the correctness of the basis of Messrs. Wood and Garnett's Land-Tax Statistics) were, in aggregate amount for the Division we are comparing, 12·42 per Cent., being a reduction from the proportionate figures of 1691, although Davenant would have us believe that, in 1692, the Home Counties, in which were comprised these three, with eight others, were more hardly used than ever.

Passing on to the present time, it becomes interesting to observe to what extent, in consequence of the redemptions which have taken place since 1798, the relative ratios of contribution have been altered. In the Eastern Division we find that, in 1843, owing to the proportion redeemed to unredeemed having been somewhat less than in the average of other Divisions, the Per-Centage which it bore of the Tax was 13·6. The Supplementary Account for 1849 (TABLE II. *post*) shows that the proportion for that year was precisely the same, viz., 13·6 Per Cent. And, considering how insignificant in amount have been the redemptions since 1849, we shall not be far wrong in taking those figures as applicable to the Year 1857 for this Division.

In SECTION II of TABLE F we have considered it useful and interesting to give such Statistics as will serve to show in what parts of the country the value of Real Property has increased, how much and at what rate, in comparison of one part with another. With this view, we have annexed the amounts of annual value of Real Property in 1692 and 1851, the proportion of annual value of each County and Division to the total annual value of Real Property in 1692 and in 1814 (as the last year of the first Property and Income Tax), and to the annual value of Real Property assessed to the Property and Income Tax, and to the Poor's Rate, in 1851. We have also annexed, for the purpose of showing whether the augmen-

tations in proportionate value have been greater or less comparatively with each other in the present or in the last century, first, the figures of increase per Cent. in each Division for the 122 years 1692-1814; secondly, the increase per Cent. in each Division for the 37 Years, 1814 to 1851; and lastly, the aggregate increase per Cent. for each Division in the 159 years 1692 to 1851. It is not necessary to follow out these particulars of the Example in the present statement, as they can be seen by inspection of the Table itself.

Concluding Observations upon the incorrect Political Arithmetic of the Seventeenth Century on Land-Tax.

In the Seventeenth Century a ruder system of distinguishing the Northern and Western parts of the country prevailed than at present. For example, in the parlance of the former period, all the Counties which were not what were termed the Home Counties had the appellation of the "Northern and Western Counties." The Home Counties were Eleven in number, viz., Surrey, Hertford, Bedford, Cambridge, Kent, Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk, Berks, Bucks, and Oxon.

But the conclusions—handed down, as has been explained, for so lengthened a period of time—upon the intense injustice and partiality of the tax, taking these two great divisions of Home Counties, and of Northern and Western Counties, is, we submit, entirely negatived, and shown to be baseless, upon comparison with each other of the proportionate Statistics throughout the period, which correspond much too nearly to give colour to the charge of great inequity in the territorial apportionment of the Tax. (*See APP. II.*)

We are inclined to the opinion that much of the error of Davenant's Political Arithmetic sprung from his entertaining some such notion as Houghton had published, that comparative acreage and number of houses were better tests of the equity of the Land-Tax apportionments or Quotas than the real value of those acres and houses as income-producing property.*

* A conclusion obviously as unsound as it is unpractical. With the view of fortifying his position, Davenant misapplied Sir William Petty's statements. The following is the passage from the former's Essay on Ways and Means, which give occasion for the above remarks :—

"The excise and number of houses and hearths are no ill measures to form a judgment by of the trade, wealth, and abilities of a country. Particularly Sir William Petty, who was esteemed the best computer we ever had, in all his political arithmetic, both for England and Ireland, did very much guide himself by the hearth-money. Some light may also be had in this matter (the Land-Tax) from the late polls which have been in the kingdom. The article of Ship-Money shows how persons unconcerned did think each county ought to be rated. The apportionment of 1660 makes it appear what was the opinion of the very able committee of the House of Commons on the subject."

As regards the Hearth-Money Statistics, although there is reason for dissenting from the view, that they afford an Index to comparative wealth, they may safely be admitted to possess value in other respects, and, for example, in approximate estimates of the population in various parts of the kingdom. We apprehend, however, that the celebrated Hearth-Return estimate of Gregory King, on the important question of the numbers of the people about the time of the Revolution, is an under estimate, and that the most brilliant of living English historians has given too much faith to figures which there are grounds for reckoning as deficient to the extent of at least One Million of inhabitants, an error of about a Fifth Part of his estimate,

The extracts which have been given from the complaints against the Land-Tax of public men, from the period of the Revolution downwards, will have fully indicated how frequently the same tone of argument was adopted against it, upon grounds which, statistically re-arranged, seem inconclusive and erroneous.

Further reference to writers on constitutional and financial history, who have touched upon the Land-Tax Assessment, will prove what has been advanced as to the statements of Dr. Davenant, having been the chief, and generally the sole, authority where that argument against it has been affirmed.

But, even apart from the Statistics which have now been submitted as disproving the general tenor of Davenant's deductions, there is one other objection which ought not to be passed over, viz., that, if the argument in opposition was correct, the northern and western gentlemen—relying upon a parliamentary influence, which is represented as having exercised an undue power from the time of the Long Parliament to that of the Government of the Restoration—combined to act unjustly towards their neighbours for the paltry advantage of a lighter Assessment to the Land-Tax.

Such an accusation against that portion of the community has been shown to have formed the perennial stock of complaints against the Tax, and, notwithstanding, to have been unsupported by facts, either adduced on the occasion, or whose existence can be satisfactorily traced. Nor is it likely that the most diligent search could sift them out, seeing how antagonistic is the supposition of their truth to the historical evidence of the high character and integrity of the English country gentleman, and to that watchful spirit of public opinion which threw no dim light upon unjust dealing, even at so early a period as the Seventeenth Century.

There is also another remaining inference drawn by Davenant, upon which, fortunately, evidence in disproof is still extant. The statement that the most considerable, impartial, and unprejudiced persons apportioned the Assessments of 1660, with the care which distinguished the Assessors of the Ship-Money in 1636, was advanced by him in depreciation of the parties to the other Assessments. But, with the evidence before us of the names of the Land-Tax Commissioners of 1643, 1644, and 1656, we can come to no other conclusion than that the most respectable and honoured names of England are also to be found amongst these Commissioners.

In conclusion, it is submitted that the continuous outcry which certain public men have made against the Land-Tax, during the last four or five generations, have had as little foundation in statistical evidence as have the projects for its equalization at the present day.

APPENDIX (I).

TABLE I.
LAND-TAX REDEEMED, from 1798 to 25th March, 1849.

1	2	3	4
Land-Tax Redeemed in ENGLAND AND WALES.		Unredeemed Land-Tax.	Per Cent. of Total Tax Unredeemed.
Divn. I.—LONDON AND MIDDLESEX. (London, Westminster, and Middlesex)	£ 89,046	£ 147,203	13·0
Surrey	29,117
Kent	43,009
Sussex	27,647
Southampton.....	25,571
Berks.....	19,497
Divn. II.—SOUTH-EASTERN	144,841	151,958	13·5
Hertford	21,039
Bucks	21,702
Oxford	14,923
Northampton.....	14,928
Huntingdon	4,227
Bedford	9,998
Cambridge.....	9,579
Div. III.—SOUTH - MIDLAND } (excluding MIDDLESEX)	96,391	153,668	13·6
Essex	46,784
Suffolk	23,030
Norfolk	19,410
Div. IV.—EASTERN.....	89,224	153,743	13·6
Wilts	20,182
Dorset	10,404
Devon	29,776
Cornwall	12,464
Somerset	25,359
Div. V.—SOUTH-WESTERN	98,185	162,983	14·4
Gloucester.....	19,916
Hereford	7,393
Salop	7,738
Stafford	9,842
Worcester	13,253
Warwick	15,161
Div. VI.—WEST-MIDLAND.....	73,303	119,801	10·6

APPENDIX (I). TABLE I.—*Continued.*
 LAND-TAX REDEEMED, from 1798 to 25th March, 1849.

1	2	3	4
Land-Tax Redeemed in ENGLAND AND WALES.		Unredeemed Land-Tax.	Per Cent. of Total Tax Unredeemed.
	£	£	
Leicester	12,853
Rutland	1,266
Lincoln	19,183
Nottingham	9,167
Derby	7,094
Div. VII.—NORTH-MIDLAND....	49,563	110,835	9·8
Chester	7,803
Lancaster	8,118
Div. VIII.—NORTH-WESTERN	15,921	30,962	2·7
York, E. R.	10,161
„ N. R.	12,058
„ W. R.	22,582
Div. IX.—YORK	44,801	43,605	4·0
Durham.....	5,338
Northumberland	5,825
Cumberland	2,093
Westmoreland	1,780
Div. X.—NORTHERN	15,036	15,627	1·4
Monmouth	3,008
<i>South Wales.</i>			
Glamorgan.....	1,628
Carmarthen	1,190
Pembroke	1,281
Cardigan	397
Brecon	942
Radnor	840
<i>North Wales.</i>			
Montgomery	1,111
Flint	760
Denbigh	1,634
Merioneth	485
Carnarvon	606
Anglesea	549
Div. XI.—WELSH	14,431	37,796	3·4
ENGLAND AND WALES—TOTAL.....	730,747	1,128,177	100·0

Note.—The col. 1 is re-arranged from the Return of Land-Tax Redeemed in separate Counties alphabetically, as at 25th March, 1849. (Parliamentary Paper, 625.) Cols. 3 and 4 are calculated from data referred to in our TABLE A.

APPENDIX (II).

The TABLE II. (occupying the two following pages) contains an abstract of some of the chief features of the much more extended TABLE E. (*ante*) which has been fully described in PART II. of this paper.

The col. 10 has here been appended to show the little disturbance, in the territorial distribution of the Unredeemed Tax, which has taken place in the six years 1843-9. And, as the progress of redemption has since then been only slightly accelerated, the figures will closely represent the proportionate existing condition of the Tax in 1857.

A leading object of the annexed Abstract (which was submitted to the *Statistical Society*) is to present a condensed and comprehensive view of the proportions of the Land-Tax, assessed upon the great groups of counties in England and Wales, during a period of Two Hundred and Twenty Years.

It was verbally pointed out to the notice of the Society, that this Abstract enables a very clear idea to be formed of the partiality of the statements, made in Davenant's works, that the differences were great between the assessment of 1660—(see col. 6, said to be on the model of the Ship-Money col. 4,)—and the assessment of 1692 (see col. 8,) which has been continued to 1798 as the scale of real quotas, and, from 1798 to this time, as that of nominal quotas.

Comparing col. 8 with col. 6, the differences between the two will be as follows:—

1	2	3	4
Division No.	Group of Counties.	Proportion of Land-Tax Assessed on the Division more in 1692 than in 1660.	Proportion of Land-Tax Assessed on the Division less in 1692 than in 1660.
		Per Cent.	Per Cent.
I.	London and Middlesex	9·4
II.	South Eastern	1·4
III.	South Midland	0·7
IV.	Eastern	2·0
V.	South Western	2·6
VI.	West Midland	1·1
VII.	North Midland	0·8
VIII.	North Western	0·5
IX.	York	1·2
X.	Northern	0·5
XI.	Welsh	2·8
ENGLAND } & WALES }	Balance of Differences	11·5	11·5

With the sole exception of London and Middlesex, the extreme difference in any other division was under Three Per Cent.; the average *plus* differences in two divisions being about One Per Cent.; and the average *minus* differences in the remaining eight divisions about One and a Half Per Cent.

And, as regards the difference of about Nine and a Half Per Cent. in the Assessment of London and Middlesex, all collateral testimony would lead to the impression that the assessment of 1692 (which made its contribution to the whole Land-Tax of England and Wales 16·4 Per Cent.) was a juster estimate than the one made in 1660, and extolled by Davenant, which fixed the contribution at 7 Per Cent. It must be recollected that the Assessment of 1691, which there was no particular accusation against, had raised the quota to about Ten and Two-Thirds per Cent., and that in much earlier estimates Ten per Cent. had frequently been exceeded. And as the Tax of 1692 affected Offices and Pensions—the recipients of which were taxed in the Metropolis—the alteration in its assessment is held to have been fully accounted for.

APPENDIX II.—

TABLE II.

DISTRIBUTION OF LAND-TAX IN ENGLAND AND WALES.—

1	2	3	4	5	6
Divi- sion No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	COUNTIES IN DIVISION.	Ship-Money Land-Tax of 1636.	Land- Tax of 1644.	Land- Tax of 1660.
			Per Cent. of Total Tax.	Per Cent. of Total Tax.	Per Cent. of Total Tax.
I.	LONDON AND MID- DLESEX	{Middlesex, including London and West- minster	9·7	10·5	7·0
II.	SOUTH-EASTERN ...	{Surrey, Kent, Sussex, Hants, Berks	12·8	15·1	13·9
III.	SOUTH - MIDLAND (excluding Mid- dlesex)	{Herts, Bucks, Oxon, Northampton, Hunts, Beds, Cambridge}	12·8	10·9	12·0
IV.	EASTERN	Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk	11·5	14·9	14·4
V.	SOUTH-WESTERN...	{Wilts, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall, Somerset ..}	17·2	19·6	16·3
VI.	WEST-MIDLAND ...	{Gloucester, Hereford, Salop, Stafford, Wor- cester, Warwick	11·6	12·4	11·0
VII.	NORTH-MIDLAND ..	{Leicester, Rutland, Lin- coln, Notts, Derby....}	9·8	5·9	9·0
VIII.	NORTH-WESTERN...	Cheshire, Lancaster	1·9	3·0	3·0
IX.	YORK	{York, North, East, and West Ridings	5·8	4·8	5·8
X.	NORTHERN	{Durham, Northumber- land, Cumberland, Westmoreland	1·8	·8	2·1
XI.	WELSH	{Monmouthshire, South Wales (6 counties), North Wales (6 counties).....}	5·1	2·1	5·5
	TOTAL—ENGLAND AND WALES.....		100·0	100·0	100·0

*Continued.**(Abstract of TABLE E. &c.)—Examples from 1636 to 1843.*

7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Land-Tax of 1691.	Land-Tax of 1692 to 1798.	Land-Tax of 1843.	Land-Tax of 1849.	Real Property Assessed to Property and Income Tax, 1851.	Real Property Assessed to Relief of the Poor, 1851.	1843. Proportion of Land-Tax Redeemed to Unredeemed.	1843. Land-Tax, Rates in the Pound on Real Property.
Per Cent. of Total Tax.	Per Cent. of Total Tax.	Per Cent. of Total Tax.	Per Cent. of Total Tax.	Per Cent. of Total.	Per Cent. of Total.	Per Cent.	s. d.
10·7	16·4	13·1	13·0	14·6	12·0	37·	0 3
14·6	15·3	13·5	13·5	12·3	12·4	48·	0 3½
11·8	12·7	13·6	13·6	6·5	7·0	38·	0 6
14·5	12·4	13·6	13·6	6·6	7·3	36·	0 6
16·2	13·7	14·5	14·4	10·2	10·2	37·	0 4½
10·7	9·9	10·6	10·6	11·9	12·6	38·	0 2½
8·2	8·2	9·8	9·8	8·2	7·8	31·	0 3½
2·6	2·5	2·7	2·7	11·3	12·1	34·	0 0½
5·0	4·6	3·9	4·0	8·6	8·7	50·	0 1½
1·4	1·6	1·4	1·4	4·8	4·9	49·	0 0¾
4·3	2·7	3·3	3·4	5·0	5·0	28·	0 2½
100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	39·	0 3½